THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

OL. LII. No. 354 DECEMBER, 1949

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Editorial

Creation and Christology - - - - W. S. *Boycott*
Confirmation and St Justin - - *Archbishop of Quebec*
Some Questions to a Modern Thomist - - *Dorothy Emmet*
John Bunyan and Arthur Dent - - - *Maurice Hussey*
Ordinands' Examinations - - - - - *A Ordinand*

For full list of contents see within.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at Windsor Castle, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

. per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

the U.S.A. $3.60 payable to the Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N.Y.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D., 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. (MSS should not exceed 3,500 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)

Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.

Advisory Committee

Montgomery Belgion
The Rev. Frank Bennett
The Rev. L. J. Collins
The Rev. W. W. S. March
The Rev. Prof. E. C. Ratcliff
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

Editorial Representative in the U.S.A.: The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Editorial		441
Creation and Christology	*W. S. Boycott*	443
Confirmation and St Justin	*Archbishop of Quebec*	448
Some Questions to a Modern Thomist	*Dorothy Emmet*	453
John Bunyan and Arthur Dent	*Maurice Hussey*	459
Ordinands' Examinations	*An Ordinand*	463
Correspondence:		
Scouting as an Instrument of Evangelism	*E. H. Levinge*	467
Book Reviews:		
C. A. Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel*	*F. S. Marsh*	468
F. W. Dillistone, *The Word of God and the People of God;* Ulrich Simon, *Theology of Crisis;* E. Lampert, *The Apocalypse of History*	*John Marsh*	470
John Coventry, S.J., *Morals and Independence*	*B. S. Moss*	473
Karl Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline*	*G. W. H. Lampe*	474
John Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of St Irenæus*	*H. Chadwick*	476
L. Bender, O.P., *Ius Publicum Ecclesiasticum;* H. S. Box, *The Principles of Canon Law*	*G. R. Dunstan*	477
Shorter Notices		478
Books Received		480
Index to Volume LII		481

THEOLOGY

VOL. LII DECEMBER, 1949 No. 354

Editorial

THIS number concludes the fifty-second volume of THEOLOGY. We venture to remark upon the low price at which S.P.C.K. continues to publish the magazine in spite of the heavy increase in costs of production. The Society does this in order to keep the subscription within range of readers who can ill afford to pay more. But the publishers would not have to subsidize THEOLOGY, as they do at present, if our readers would co-operate in considerably increasing the circulation, and we suggest that there is a certain moral obligation on them to do this in response to the Society's goodwill. Will our readers, then, please use the opportunity, which Christmas and the beginning of a new year offer, to urge upon their theologically interested friends, lay as well as clerical, the advantage of subscribing to THEOLOGY, and also remember that an annual subscription on behalf of a friend is a possible Christmas present? We hope next year to appear in a brighter cover like that which we donned about ten years ago but which had to be temporarily abandoned owing to the exigencies of the war.

* * * * *

Christmas is also about the only time in the year when some at least of our readers can with an easy mind procure some of the books that are reviewed in these pages, thanks to the excellent institution of "book tokens." We are often asked at this season what books, that have been published during the course of the year, we would specially recommend, and a few suggestions here may not be unwelcome to those who will shortly be wanting to select some recently published theological works. First, we would call attention to the fact that Mgr Ronald Knox has now completed his translation of the Bible. The second volume of the Old Testament made its appearance in November.[1] It is a great achievement, and it will be a good investment. The fact that the translation is based on the text of the Vulgate is in various ways a disadvantage to readers who are not Roman Catholics, but they will miss much who refuse the benefit of Mgr Knox's mastery of our language and his resourcefulness in the use of idiomatic English. It has been generally agreed that in the New Testament his translation of the Epistles is more illuminating than that of the Gospels, and in the Old Testament it will be found that it is the prophetic writings rather than the historical books which he makes freshly and surprisingly intelligible. This is partly due to the fact that the latter are comparatively intelligible in any translation, but still more to Mgr Knox's deter-

[1] *The Holy Bible. II. Job-Machabees.* Burns Oates. 21s.

mination to extract a tolerably plain meaning from even the most obscure passages. Those who have scruples about the legitimacy of this particular proceeding or about other aspects of the translation will do well to read the book of essays,[1] in which he has explained the principles on which he worked and the difficulties which he encountered in his task. This book is indeed a lively introduction to the problems involved not only in translating the language of the Bible but of conveying its message to the English mind.

* * * * *

Among other books of general interest that have been recommended during the past year the following may particularly be recalled; we add in brackets the month and page on which a review will be found.

T. B. Strong. By Harold Anson. S.P.C.K. 8s 6d. (September, p. 346.)

Christianity and Civilization. Part I. By Emil Brunner. Nisbet. 10s. (September, p. 322.)

The Christian in Philosophy. By J. V. Langmead Casserley. Faber. 18s. (July, p. 276.)

Religion and Culture. By Christopher Dawson. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d. (September, p. 322.)

The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology. By H. R. McAdoo. Longmans. 12s. 6d. (October, p. 390.)

The Crisis in the University. By Sir Walter Moberly. S.C.M. Press. 15s. (May, p. 161.)

The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ. By A. M. Ramsey. Longmans. 9s. 6d. (June, p. 201.)

The Shaking of the Foundations. By Paul Tillich. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d. (July, p. 241.)

For our part, if we had to select a theological "book of the year," it is upon the last of those that we have just named that our choice would fall.

[1] *On Englishing the Bible.* Burns Oates. 6s.

Creation and Christology

THE Christological passages of the New Testament emphasize the relation of the person of Christ to the O.T. doctrine of creation in such a way that the two are interlocked. He comes into the world as the completion and fulfilment of creation and the Creator's work. Indeed, if we are true to the N.T., we cannot appeal to an isolated figure in history breaking into the created world and having no part in it (this is the "glass-case" Christ); instead we have to appeal to Him who is the Prince of Life, the completion of the original *fiat* of God in creation. Christ, unless He is understood within the whole Creator-creation relationship, will be misunderstood. Many of our theological misunderstandings of Christ, and our confusions about the incarnation, arise perhaps either from a total disregard of any doctrine of creation or from assigning to it much too little importance. Without Christ, creation is a plot without a dénouement, a mystery without a solution.[1] Creation is explained in Christ, but we must be careful not to fall into the error of saying Christ is explained by creation. Any explanation of Christ we derive from creation is due only to the fact that this is the true starting point for consideration of Him. As creation started "in the beginning," so, too, Christ was with God "in the beginning" (Gen. i, 1, cp. John i, 1). Because of what Christ was (and is) a definite doctrine of creation as the self-determined work of the Creator is essential before attempting to understand the full significance of Christ in the N.T.

The whole subject of Christ and creation is one of great importance, and needs a whole volume to itself to work out in detail its many aspects and the bearing it must have upon our doctrine of the church, the eucharist, and others which are derived from that of the person of Christ. Here all we can attempt is, first, to try to show the close connexion between the creation language of the O.T. and the Christological passages of the N.T., and from this show the necessity of a conviction concerning a Christian doctrine of creation if we are to appreciate fully Christ Himself or those things which depend upon Him.

We might approach the whole subject by a detailed exposition of just one text of scripture as, *e.g.*, "all things are gathered together in Christ" (Eph. i, 10) or that He is the "beginning of creation" (Rev. iii, 14). These and others all seem to link up, and His relationship to creation does not rest upon one text or even upon one author, but runs right through the N.T. For this reason it seems best to set out the Christological passages side by side with some of the creation passages of the O.T. and Apocrypha. (See p. 444.)

The Colossian passage may well be regarded as of prime importance. But we must not confine ourselves to this. A careful study of these quotations will show how justified we are in ascribing to

[1] Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 38.

Creation and the Person of Christ.

Gen. i, 1.
In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

Ps. civ, 24.
O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom thou hast made them all . . .

Ps. cxxxvi, 5.
To him that by wisdom made the heavens.

Jer. x, 12.
He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom . . .

Prov. iii, 19-20.
The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens.

Ibid., viii, 22 ff.
The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way before the works of old; I was set up for everlasting, from the beginning or ever the world was. . . . Then was I with him as one brought up with him. (V. 35) Whoso findeth me [wisdom] findeth life.

Wisd. vii, 22 ff.
Wisdom which is the worker of all things . . . is more moving than any motion; she passeth and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness . . . the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty . . . the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of his goodness.

Wisd. ix, 1, 9.
Lord of mercy, who hast made all things with thy word . . . wisdom was with thee; which knoweth thy works and was present when thou madest the world.

Ecclus. i, 1 ff.
All wisdom cometh from the Lord . . . the word of God most high is the fountain of wisdom . . . and he created her, . . . and poured her out upon all his works. To fear the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.

Ibid. xxiv, 25.
He filleth all things with his wisdom.

Ibid. xlvi, 26.
By his word all things consist.

John i, 1-14.
In the beginning was the word . . . the word was God. . . . All things were made by him. . . . In Him was life . . . which was born . . . of God. The word was made flesh . . . full of grace and truth.

Rom. xi, 36.
For of him and through him and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever.

1 Cor. i, 24.
Christ the power of God, the wisdom of God.

Ibid., viii, 6.
. . . one God, of whom all things are; and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things.

Eph. i, 10.
That he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth.

Col. i, 15 ff.
. . . the firstborn of every creature. for by him all things were made that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible . . . all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell.

Heb. i, 1-3.
God who . . . spoken to us by his son whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds . . . the express image of his person upholding all things by the word of his power when he had purged us from our sins and sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.

Rev. iii, 14.
The faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.

Christ the office of Fulfiller.[1] The faith of the O.T. rests firmly not only upon the fact that God is the Creator of all things but upon the further hope of a fulfilling Messiah as well. These two ideas seem, here and there, to merge together; the coming of the messianic age will in some fashion have an effect upon all creation, hence the idea of "messianic fertility" (cp. Is. xi, 6 ff. and Hos. ii, 23). It is not so strange then to find Christ Himself personifying important O.T. ideas and phrases about creation. He Himself *is* the Creator (. . . the image of God . . . by Him were all things created, Col. i, 15, 16). Or again He is the Firstborn (i, 16 and Heb. i, 6 etc. Cp. Ps. xxxvi, 6). The Firstborn not in time but He who takes precedence over all creation; He has priority over all born creatures, which, like a legal right given to the eldest son of a family, provides a just lordship over all creation. He is Heir of all things by whom God made the worlds (Heb. i, 2); this appears to have been preordained from the beginning of creation. From this it is an easy step to Christ as the Wisdom of God by which, again, He made all things (1 Cor. i, 24 and 30) and as the creative Word made flesh (John i, 14). If we contemplate these last words carefully, it seems possible to say that the incarnation was as much the necessary climax to God's original plan of creation, as creation was the preparation for the incarnation.

It is as the personal fulfilment of creative wisdom that we see Him best perhaps as the Fulfiller of what is fundamental to the theology of the O.T. and Apocrypha. Wisdom as creative has been called the "dogmatic centre" of the whole Book of Wisdom,[2] particularly the long passage Wisd. vii, 22 ff. The description here applied to wisdom fits our highest and noblest conceptions of Christ. In Wisdom the worker of all things is an understanding spirit, holy, one only, manifold, subtle, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to hurt,[3] loving the thing which is good, quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do good. Kind to men, stedfast, free from care, having all power . . . (vii, 22, 23), God loveth none but him that dwelleth in wisdom (v. 28), and ". . . vice cannot prevail against wisdom" (v. 30). The glory of the Easter triumph is found in the doctrine of wisdom. So far as Christ is now our "dogmatic centre" it is important to realize what exactly is the foundation of this, for He came not to destroy but to fulfil. We should notice also that Paul links Christ as the wisdom of God with the power of God, the creative power which works through wisdom. Hebraic wisdom is not, like Hellenistic wisdom, a mere intellectual knowing which is, indeed, regarded with some disfavour by the prophets.[4] The wisdom of the O.T. is, on the other hand, an organic relationship with God the Creator and out of this, as out of the stem of Jesse, burst with living growth, faith, and intellectual ap-

[1] See Hebert, *The Authority of the O.T.*, p. 226; and Radford, *Colossians*, pp. 179-80; also Burney, *J.T.S.*, xxvii, pp. 160 ff.
[2] Charles Harris, *S.P.C.K. Commentary*, p. 74.
[3] In His manhood Christ was subject to hurt, but not in His final glory.
[4] Isa. v, 21; xxix, 14; Jer. ix, 22; vii, 8-9, etc.

prehension, as well as legal and moral standards. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom (Job xxviii, 28, etc.), the start of an appreciation of what it is, an activity seen especially in creation, to which instruction is complementary (Prov. i, 2 and 5).

The person and teaching of Christ are not to be separated, as is more and more becoming realized;[1] what He *was* and what He *did* and *said* hang together in a unity. Thus we can find references to His personification of wisdom in His own words about Himself. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father . . ." (Matt. xi, 27), then He continues making use of some verses from Ecclus. Here once more the words put side by side speak better for themselves.

Ecclus. li, 23, 26, 27.

Draw near unto me [wisdom] and dwell in the house of learning . . . put your neck under the yoke and let your soul receive instruction. . . . Behold with your eyes how that I have but little labour, and have gotten me much rest.[2]

Matt. xi, 28-30.

Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light.

The close connexion between these two passages is too striking to be overlooked. The comfortable words are not an invitation to escape from the (evil?) world of creation, but an exhortation to its fulfilment in Himself. Since our Lord uses the idea of "learning" of Him, and "yoke" is a rabbinic metaphor for teaching, it has been assumed, I think incorrectly, that this fulfilment is only wisdom in the sense of intellectual knowing, as an agent of revelation.[3] This seems to be over-simplifying the issue and disregarding the essential creative attributes of divine wisdom. It may well be that in divine wisdom, as contrasted with mere human wisdom, creation and revelation are combined, so that creation is both a form of, and a means to, revelation. This at any rate seems to be implied in the Person of Christ Himself, and thus bids us pay attention to creation as the basis of all revelation rather than assume that revelation can stand on its own apart from creation.[4] Our Lord alludes to the same thought in quite another form in "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John v, 17). *Work* must be understood as inclusive, creation no less than preservation and redemption; He is co-ordinate with the Creator, He Himself is the Creator, and upon this our faith in Him must stand or fall (John x, 37) or be, at any rate, a first step towards "believing for the works' sake" (xiv, 11). He came to give life a more abundant meaning (John x, 10). Only the Creator Himself is capable of doing this. Life for the Christian may

[1] Hoskyns and Davey, *The Riddle of the N.T.*, p. 145.

[2] *Soul* here in the biblical sense not in any way in contrast to the body, rather as bound up with and giving the body its true significance. Hence the instruction becomes complementary to creation.

[3] Cp. Narborough in *The Trinity and the Incarnation* (Ed. Rawlinson), pp. 41-2.

[4] Cp. difficult text of Deut. viii, 3: "man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word [or thing, R.V.] . . ." "Every word" may be read as a contrast to the bread, but may it not be much better understood as complementary to it?

seem to have a "double" meaning (*psyche* and *zoe*), yet for Him they merge into each other (John xii, 25), a paradoxical contrast becomes a union, as is seen by the appeal to creation concerning His own person (xii, 24). His claim, not merely on Israel, but on the whole of creation, is seen in the parable of the rightful Heir, which is mistakenly thought of as the parable of the wicked Husbandmen.

Enough has been said perhaps to show that any faith we have in Christ or any doctrine of His person is false and incomplete so long as a conviction about divine creation is regarded as unnecessary. Belief in Him demands that we should "consider the lilies" as intensely as possible; seldom do we pause even to ask the simple question *why* so much of His teaching relates to creation. His free use in His teaching of creation points back to the Creator and to Himself. "One is your father in heaven" (Matt. xxiii, 9) has much biological truth behind it, since no science can explain what life *is*. Yet it is strict theological biology, like the engendering of Obed (Ruth iv, 13).

Except perhaps for the early Greek fathers, Origen and Clement in particular, creation was to say the very least given a back seat in the church's thought. The whole of our doctrinal structure is built up on an isolated Christ. Creation was tainted with evil, God and the world were antithetical.[1] All this seems a tragic misunderstanding of the N.T. in which Christ is not the divine intruder upon the cosmos, as the church, for the most part, has seen Him. In order to assert that He is "all and in all" (Col. iii, 11) it must be remembered the second "all" is neuter—*i.e.*, all creation, not all mankind.

Christ's close connexion with all creation is an essential part of His fullness[2] (*pleroma*), His completeness, ampleness, and copiousness. *Pleroma* is the fullness found in garments, not the fullness of a container which is the same container when empty. The *pleroma* of the Godhead (Col. ii, 9) is the whole of the divine attributes formed into one. Further, He came to pass on to us the *pleroma* (John i, 16; Eph. iii, 19 and iv, 13), which finds (or should find) a prominent place in the doctrines of the church and the eucharist which are derived from, and shaped by, His own person. His body *is* the fullness of Him (Eph. i, 23). Space does not allow us to discuss how little this fullness is found in our discussions about the church to-day. In the eucharist the bread and wine are offered because they are His ("The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof"). He, as "the Bread of Life," links the eucharist with the bread of understanding . . . and the water of wisdom (Ecclus. xv, 3), and with the invitation to fill ourselves with the fruits of wisdom (Ecclus. xxiv, 19). Thus in Him creation, wisdom, and the partaking of His body and blood come together. It is wisdom, the source of all creation, which "pours out" our doctrine (Ecclus. xxiv, 33).

We have said enough perhaps to show that to assert the real

[1] For a sketch of the relations of Christ to the world in the history of doctrine, see Raven's *Jesus and His Gospel of Love*, ch. xiv.

[2] See note on *pleroma* in Radford's *Colossians*, p. 183.

authority of Christ we must proclaim Him in close relation to the doctrine of creation which He found waiting for Him in the O.T. and Apocrypha. That God is "Maker of heaven and earth," "preserver of all things," and Christ is He "by whom all things were made," find their place in our creeds and articles, but is our thinking about Christ made truly relevant to creation, which, even in face of the great fact of redemption, is the "key fact" of our faith? The scientific attitude towards creation is much less sure of itself than say fifty years ago. Ecology (the relations between living organisms) is a young idea taking the limelight from evolution. A complete marriage between Christian theology and ecology is a forlorn hope.[1] Yet it remains that any Christian account of creation must take account of Christ Himself, as conversely any doctrine of Christ cannot omit direct reference to creation.

W. S. Boycott.

Confirmation and St Justin

Turning back to Theology of April, 1948, I read with great interest the article written by Professor Ratcliff on confirmation in St Justin. He is surely quite right, and Justin does allude to what we call confirmation when he describes the introduction of the newly baptized person into the prayer-life of the church. There is no allusion to the laying on of hands; but we would not necessarily expect this in the sketch of church procedure which he is making for Gentile readers; and it may, as Professor Ratcliff suggests, be a case of reticence with regard to a *musterion* of the church. The silences and reticences of the earliest Christian authors would make a good subject for a special study.

Perhaps a few observations on the subject of confirmation in the earliest period may be of interest. There is, in the first place, a mere practical point, a point of technique and procedure. The baptism took place quite often, perhaps normally, in a stream; it is difficult to suppose that there was always a full gathering of the ecclesia; at any rate there would be a subsequent point at which there was a meeting of the whole ecclesia, and the newly baptized person would be welcomed for the first time into the prayer-life of the brotherhood. We see behind the language of Justin the ecclesiastical fact of these two occasions; and the two occasions have a different theological emphasis; water-baptism pure and simple emphasizes the individual act and the individual experience; the reception into the prayer-life emphasizes the social order of the church. With which would we associate the gift of the Holy Spirit?

Now how are we to regard confirmation? How can we define it in its broadest aspect? It is an act or experience (perhaps both) de-

[1] Cf. "The marriage of true science and true religion is one of the most urgent needs of our time," *Lambeth Report*, 1948, Part II, p. 6. Cp. also resolution No. 3.

pendent upon baptism, but distinguishable from it, in which the Holy Spirit is received. As such we can see it emerge from time to time in the pages of the New Testament, at one moment to all appearances integrated with the idea of baptism, at another clearly distinguished from it.

In Galatians iii the reception of the Spirit is a clearly defined event to which the apostle can readily appeal. It is a date in the life of the new Christian (iii, 2), a point of beginning (iii, 4), an experience (iii, 4) through which he went. It is connected with his baptism when he became a son of God by faith in Christ Jesus (iii, 26). It was the point at which he received the "sonship" (adoption) (iv, 5): "And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father."

My suggestion is that this is no piece of abstract theology, but a reference to what had actually occurred when the Galatians expressed their faith in Christ Jesus and were baptized. It may have been as they rose from the water, it may have been at a rather later stage, but at any rate, as a result or consequence of their baptism, the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they uttered cries, prominent in which were the words "Abba, Father." To express it in the words of Acts, "the Spirit came upon them and they spake with tongues and prophesied."

The sequence of thought in Galatians is repeated and elaborated in Romans viii, in which the reception of the Spirit is treated of separately from the subject of baptism, which has been dealt with in vi. "You received the spirit of sonship in which we cry, Abba, Father," the apostle says, repeating even the change from the second to the first person plural; and as in Galatians, the repetition of this formula follows a reference to God "sending his own son" (Romans viii, 3, Galatians iv, 4). And, furtheremore, he goes on in Romans to work out the connexion between the possession of the Spirit and the gift of prayer.

Several suggestions occur to one with regard to the formula "Abba, Father." In the first place we seem to have a trace of the glossolalia or speaking with tongues which followed the reception of the Spirit; the common method of explaining this phenomenon to-day is as an irrational mental activity expressing itself for the most part in unintelligible sounds or words. There may well have been a good deal of this at Corinth, but on the other hand glossolalia may not have been everywhere the same. It can well have operated on a higher level (even in Corinth), and have had some connexion with the success with which a gospel originally Semitic broke through the barriers of language into the Greek world, or even into other linguistic groups, a thought which seems to be present in the narrative of the Day of Pentecost in Acts ii. The word "Abba," like other Aramaic words, may be a piece of Semitic flotsam and jetsam left in the pages of the Greek New Testament by this overflowing of the waters.

Furthermore, it seems to be assumed that the speaking with tongues was, if I may so express it, a solo performance. I have always

found it hard to believe that all the numerous converts baptized in the apostolic age would prove capable of such a feat; and perhaps it was not so. Perhaps the new Christian merely *took part* in the speaking with tongues and prophesying which was going on; he "spake with tongues and prophesied" *like the rest*; he entered into the brotherhood of prayer and worship. Now 1 Corinthians certainly gives us a picture of a community in which *all* were prophesying or speaking with tongues, and the apostle finds it necessary to ask for some regulation of this scene of confusion; he thinks that two or three speakers are enough.

Furthermore, the scene is liturgical. The expressions of the Spirit-filled man are addressed to God; he prays or give thanks; he even sings. An Amen is said at the end of his eucharist; another foreign word. A newly baptized convert, introduced into this assembly, might feel the enthusiasm, and join in the worship to a greater or a lesser degree; he would pick up the strange evangelical and liturgical refrains, originally Semitic and still loaded with Semitic words, as a stranger in a crowd picks up the refrain of a revivalist hymn. It should not be assumed, of course, that in every "ecclesia of the saints" there would be a scene of confusion equal to that at Corinth; indeed, the apostle suggests the contrary; God is a God of order not of chaos.

We come to a second thought which inevitably suggests itself. The Spirit "in our hearts" cries out (through our lips) the words "Abba, Father," thus showing itself to be the spirit of sonship; the newly baptized convert calls upon God as his Father. So it is in 1 Peter i, 17; he has become one of the saints, and therefore invokes as his Father the God who judges without respect of persons; and this would also seem to be the moment alluded to in Ephesians v, 18*b*-21 and Colossians iii, 15*b*-17. (See my *Primitive Christian Catechism, ad loc.*) The words, then, which are expected of the new believer, as his first utterance in the Spirit, may be described as the invocation of God as Father.

We cannot now avoid asking the question whether the convert is not for the first time using the Our Father. The words "Abba, Father" were well known, and carried far in the Gentile mission, for they appear in the Roman gospel of Mark, on the lips of Jesus in the story of Gethsemane, a Marcan lection which has some affinity with the Our Father. There is a remarkable degree of silence and reticence about this prayer in the earliest documents, though it must have had an important position at some point in the evangelical and liturgical tradition. It appears in Matthew and Luke in very different forms, and not again, I think, until the *Didache*, where it appears in a form resembling Matthew rather than Luke, and then in the *De Oratione* of Tertullian, where the form is quite peculiar, "Thy will be done" preceding "Thy kingdom come."

Leaving this point on one side, I cannot help reaching the conclusion that the reception of the Spirit in Christian initiation, while it was regarded as a result or consequence of holy Baptism, was associated with the introduction of the neophyte into the brother-

hood of prayer and praise, and that his first utterance was an invocation of God as Father, possibly in the words of the Lord's Prayer, and that this was the occasion which has come to be known as confirmation.

The fragmentary references in Paul which have guided us so far do not mention the laying on of hands. For the use of that action we have to rely upon the witness of Acts, the author of which regards it as the normal apostolic practice, though there are cases in which the Spirit comes spontaneously; in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch it is after baptism, in the case of Cornelius and his household before baptism. Our estimate of this evidence will depend upon our view of Acts, but in any case it was written when the practice of the apostles was still well known in the church. The laying on of hands in confirmation was a first-century practice.

The liturgical procedure of Christendom was never shapeless, even in the apostolic age. Why should it be? The major liturgical features had their proper place in the tradition as a whole. What was the place of the Lord's Prayer? It is strange that our liturgical scholars should have devoted so little attention to the place and purpose of the most sacred feature in our whole liturgical tradition. Too much faith has been reposed in statements of Augustine and Gregory, which place it at the end of the Prayer of Consecration in the eucharist. The earliest example of this, I think, is in the *Catechetical Lectures* of Cyril of Jerusalem: but Cyril places all his intercessions at the same point; his order is Thanksgivings and Prayers, rather than Prayers and Thanksgivings. Where the intercessions preceded the eucharist, as in Justin and Hippolytus, the Our Father may have done so also.

Furthermore, Cyril appends a short explanation of the Our Father which has points of resemblance with the explanations in the *De Oratione* of Tertullian and the *De Oratione* of Cyprian. It would be interesting to study this tradition of an explanation of the Lord's Prayer for catechumens.

Returning now to St Justin, we find that we are given two scenes in the liturgical sequence: first, the baptism in a place "where there is water," which is preceded by prayers and fasting; then an assembly of those who are called brethren for "common prayers" and the kiss, which is followed by the eucharist. There is no reference to any readings of scripture such as take place at the usual Sunday eucharist. Common prayers, kiss, and eucharist seem to be sufficient; and we remember that in Hippolytus the unbaptized catechumen has no share in the prayer or kiss of the brethren. This experience is new to him.

Reverting now to *Didache*, which may not be much older than the *Apology* of Justin, we find that prayers and fasting precede baptism. There is a note to this effect after the brief description of the baptismal rite. It then goes on to give the text of the Lord's Prayer and to order its recital three times a day; formulas for the baptismal eucharist follow. (Note especially ix, 5, and x, 2.) It is significant that these directions, along with directions for the Wed-

nesday and Friday fast, follow baptism and precede the baptismal eucharist. The Lord's Prayer appears to come in its correct place if we assume that it was "delivered" to the newly baptized convert at the moment which we describe as confirmation and prior to the eucharist. The text of *Didache* is not in good order, and the editor does not seem to have fully understood his sources. He has remarkable silences and reticences. His eucharistic formulas are in disorder and fail to give a picture of the whole rite. Prophets intervene *ad lib.*, as in 1 Corinthians xiv. Refrains of Semitic origin occur (x, 6).

The Marcionite Our Father substituted for "Hallowed by thy Name," the words "May thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us," which would suit a baptismal occasion. The word Spirit may have been thought of as making explicit some of the implications of the use of the word Name in Hebrew liturgy (cf. *Didache* x, 2). In the apostolic age there is an epiclesis of the Name but not of the Spirit. The words "upon us" are added to clauses of the Our Father in the explanations of that prayer given by Tertullian, Cyprian, and Cyril of Jerusalem, and are doubtless part of a catechetical tradition which may be as old as Marcion and Justin.

The full picture of a confirmation on the lines of our reconstruction is to be found, however, in the Syrian tradition preserved in *Apostolic Constitutions*, vii, 44, in which the candidate, on coming up from the water, is anointed, receives the laying on of hands, and recites the Lord's Prayer. The same procedure is found in iii, 18: "Let him that is baptized be . . . chaste, pure, holy, beloved of God, the son of God, praying as a son to his father, and saying as from the common congregation of the faithful, Our Father," etc.

The *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus has no reference to the Lord's Prayer. It is one of his reticences. After the laying on of hands and anointing, the candidate is admitted to the prayers and receives the kiss, and the eucharist immediately follows. The Our Father may be included in the reference to the prayers, unless, indeed, it is the "other matter" which may be imparted secretly by the bishop to those who are communicated; "he shall not tell this to any but the faithful and only after they have first been communicated."

We cannot perhaps assume or seek for an exact uniformity of order in the developing liturgical procedure, but there may be room for research along the lines of the supposition that confirmation meant the welcome into the common prayers and thanksgivings in the Spirit by means of the laying on of hands and the kiss, and that the first use of the Our Father by the convert would naturally occur at this point. In the Anglican rite the Our Father follows the laying of hands so that it repeats this pattern, which was at any rate the custom of the Syrian Church. Its importance could be emphasized by asking the candidates to repeat this prayer alone, the congregation remaining silent.

PHILIP QUEBEC.

Some Questions to a Modern Thomist

At a recent international conference of philosophy at Amsterdam I was invited to give a paper in the section entitled "Metaphysics." The meetings of the sections went on through the afternoons and took the form of a number of short papers followed by discussion. Any continuity in the themes of successive papers was a matter of good luck rather than prearrangement. I attended the paper before mine, an able one by M. le Père Boyer of the Gregorian Institute in Rome, and I listened attentively for links which I could pick up in introducing my own theme, managing to hit on one or two. But any ingenuity I exercised over this was wasted. At the change over from his paper to mine at the end of the hour, to my considerable amusement, the whole of his audience (consisting largely of serried ranks of cassocked seminarists) got up and walked out, and members of the British, American, and Dominions delegations, along with some secular continentals, walked in. I do not think that this was mainly due to the language difficulty, since people seemed quite ready to attend papers and discussions in other languages when the approach was that of their own philosophical tradition. But it was apparent throughout the congress that a strong stream of Catholic and Thomistic philosophy was going on its way and mingling very little with the other streams. Moreover, listeners to recent broadcast debates in the Third Programme between a distinguished representative of the Thomist tradition and representatives of forms of contemporary empiricism must have been struck by the lack of any real engagement between the two sides of the debate. Arguments which seemed cogent and even self-evident to the one side failed utterly to convince the other. Yet, if the Thomist position is founded on an appeal to the "natural reason," in a contemporary discussion *contra Gentiles* the Thomist arguments should seem cogent to others besides those trained in that tradition.

A familiar criticism is of course that Thomists identify the "natural reason" with certain particular features of Aristotelianism which have now been superseded. Philosophers and philosophical theologians should therefore turn with interest to Dr Mascall's recent book,[1] in which he discusses the basic Thomist doctrines of "Existence" and "Analogy" from the point of view of a "modern Thomism." By a modern Thomism he explains he means an attempt to present the profundities of St Thomas' metaphysical thinking apart from the particular interests of the thirteenth century and apart from certain particularities in the Aristotelian logic, and in this he claims (surely with justification) that he is being true to the essential spirit of St Thomas. So in discussing the "Five Ways" he says, for instance, that while the particular argument about Motion in the "First Way" reflects thirteenth-century interests, the real point of all the "Ways" is that they illustrate different aspects of the finite-infinite relation, the "cosmological relation" on which the Thomist

[1] *Existence and Analogy*, by E. L. Mascall. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

argument for Theism rests. Dr Mascall is concerned to show the cogency of the "cosmological argument" based on this relation as a valid argument of rational theology. (In fact it would seem from his conclusion that rational theology is concerned with little else.) I shall try to say something about some of the reasons why I think most contemporary philosophical students find it difficult to see the force of this argument. This may help forward the discussion more than if I dwell on the merits of Dr Mascall's exposition, which will be apparent to all readers of the book, and perhaps Dr Mascall or some other modern Thomist will answer some of our misunderstandings.

By "rational theology" is meant such arguments as should convince any candid mind, without appealing to faith in revelation, or (presumably) to ways of thinking peculiar to a historical religious tradition. But this raises the question of whether what Dr Mascall and others call rational theology is in fact an independent study, or whether it could exist in this form except within a certain tradition of Jewish-Christian thought. For instance, a major point of Thomist natural theology is that there can be a kind of being in which "essence and existence are one." How would an independent mind understand this? Dr Mascall writes that the Christian "knows what he means by God because the Bible and the Church have told him. He can then institute a purely rational inquiry into the grounds for asserting God exists." "What he means by God" St Thomas tells us, approaching from the Biblical end and quoting Exodus iii, 14, is that His proper name is "He Who Is" (Dr Mascall has an admirable discussion of how a text such as this should be interpreted in its Biblical setting). But how do you inquire into whether "'He who is' is"? We might say, only if "He who is" is a definiton of the meaning of "God," and we then inquire whether there is an existent satisfying this meaning. But Dr Mascall presses with great vigour the "existentialist" interpretation of St Thomas. Against all forms of the Ontological Argument, he maintains "existence is not a predicate," and cannot be the subject of a *concept* but only of a *judgment* or *assertion*. So to say that "the meaning of God is 'He Who Is'" would have to be equivalent to asserting *that* He is. This still sounds very like an attempt to derive "existence" from a sentence, which seems to bring us back to something like the Ontological Argument.[1] But there is this distinction. What is being maintained is not that the existence of God is deducible from His definition, but

[1] Dr Mascall mentions (p. 25) a variant on the ontological argument by which the existence of the Devil might be proved. "An interesting variant which has been pointed out to me is that we could similarly prove the existence of a being so bad that no worse could be conceived. For, if such a being did not exist, we could conceive a similar one which did exist, and this would obviously be worse." I discussed this point with the late Professor Laird shortly before his death, and we decided that in the ontologists' terms it would have to be said that the Devil either did not exist or was diminishing to zero. Since in these terms evil is emptiness of being, and perfect emptiness would be nothing, the Devil would have either not to exist or be the emptiest of possible beings. (Spinoza would say "most miserable," and for him, strictly, misery is a transi-

that to say that "the meaning of God is 'He Who Is'" is equivalent to asserting that He is. But what sort of concept is it of which the *meaning* is the same as an existential assertion or, in Thomist language, in which "essence and existence" are one? It can only be one which has extension but no intension, and we are left completely agnostic as to *what* we are asserting "is." (There are some interpreters of Thomism who would, I think, accept this.)

We may however be told that, in saying that "The meaning of God is 'He Who Is,'" we are still not dealing with "rational theology" but with a statement deriving, not indeed from an isolated text in Exodus, but from the authority of the Bbilical tradition, as epitomized in the Exodus text. And so understood, the saying may mean that we are not arguing about the existence of God but asserting it in faith. The rational inquiry would then be an attempt to see whether the *same* assertion can be made on independent grounds. This calls for a careful examination of what the grounds are, and whether they are in fact independent of the Biblical tradition. The grounds adduced are of course the argument from "contingent" to "necessary" being. Listeners to the recent broadcast discussions to which I already referred may have noticed that the discussions at this point end in a stalemate because of the complete inability of the modern logicians to see what this distinction can mean. This may be perversity on the part of modern logicians; but I cannot help thinking it is also due to a failure on the part of Thomists to make sufficiently clear to those educated in other traditions how this crucial relation is to be conceived. Dr Farrer has gone deeper into this than anyone else in *Finite and Infinite*, but he has done it by travelling into a position not altogether Thomist. (Dr. Mascall criticizes him for making concessions to post-Kantian epistemology. In my view that is a strength, for reasons which will appear later.) The relation is of course strictly undefinable because it is unique (hence the need to try and talk about it in analogies). It is a relation of dependence, but not the logically necessary dependence of ground and consequent, though it is something like this (Dr Mascall uses the word "ground" but guards himself against saying that this makes the relation one of logical dependence). Nor is it causality in the ordinary sense or senses (whatever these may be). Most Thomists are content to say that it is a kind of causality and to leave it at that, with the addition of "First" to "Cause," but Dr. Mascall sees this will not do. The unique relation is then said to be that of creator/creature. But will it do to present this Biblical concept of creation as a concept of rational theology, as though it were independently intelligible? Moreover, the creator/creature conception is not put forward as an analogy but as the relation in virtue of which we know we can draw analogies. Dr Mascall does

tion to lesser perfection.) The argument that a most evil existent being would be worse than a most evil non-existent being is not valid in the ontologists' terms, since to them existence is always a perfection and not an imperfection, so that "worse" would here be being used in a sense not relevant to the argument.

indeed say, following Gilson, that this is a conception which has grown up within the Hebrew-Christian tradition and that the Greeks did not have it. But according to the Thomist view, whatever the origins of the concepts of rational theology, they should then surely stand on their own feet as intelligible. I cannot see that the notion of "creation out of nothing" is one which can be called rationally intelligible. It may be that it is the best term which can be used for a unique relation of dependence, but then we should recognize that we are falling back on a Biblical term, and not present this as a piece of rational theology which would convince any independent mind without appeal to the Biblical tradition. This means that instead of drawing the distinction between rational and revealed theology as Thomists draw it, a Christian theologian should make clear that he is analysing and attempting to make intelligible certain ways of thinking which have grown up within the Jewish-Christian tradition.

I think that the cosmological argument can be called "rational" in the sense that *if* the world is dependent on a transcendent creator, that would be one explanation for it. But there are other possible ways of looking at it; for instance, it might be said that, though any part of the world looked at in isolation may seem contingent, seen in its context in nature as a whole it is not contingent, and that nature as a whole may be the necessary being. Or we can question this use of "necessary" and "contingent" and say that they are not applicable to "existence"; that existence is not something for which explanations can be given, but to which explanations must refer. I believe that it is true that if you just take the fact of existence for granted, and are not struck by there being a mystery in it, you are unlikely to be religious and that this gives a real starting point for religious thinking. But it is a long way from this to say that the cosmological argument is intelligibly demonstrated.[1]

To turn to another side of the discussion. Dr Mascall claims that the Thomist epistemology contains in principle the solution of the subjectivist problems which beset post-Kantian theories of knowledge. He says that closer attention to Thomist views might get, for instance, this reviewer out of some of her difficulties in a recent book (which he discusses much too generously). I do not want to take up space in defending the very tentative theory of knowledge in that book—that is not important. But perhaps for any whom it may interest I may be allowed to continue the discussion by saying that, even after giving more attention to Thomist views, I cannot think that they really solve the problem of the objectivity of knowledge. I

[1] Coleridge saw the act of existing as a religious mystery. "Hast thou ever raised thy mind to the consideration of existence, in and by itself, as the mere act of existing? Hast thou ever said to thyself thoughtfully, It is! Heedless in that moment, whether it were a man before thee, or a flower, or a grain of sand,—without reference, in short, to this or that particular mode or form of existence? If thou hast indeed attained to this, thou wilt have felt the presence of a mystery, which must have fixed thy spirit with awe and wonder." (From *The Friend*, III, 192. Quoted by H. Read, *Coleridge as Critic*, p. 30. The whole passage repays consideration.)

agree with Dr Mascall and the Thomists in wanting to maintain an ultimate realism, and in thinking that to do this we must be able to say that we are in some dynamic interaction and rapport with an environing world before we begin to think about it. But when we pass to the problem of *how* this world not only affects us, but gets itself known, I cannot see that the particular Thomist view of "intelligible" and "sensible species" really solves our problem. I think the Thomists are probably right in distinguishing the final object of knowledge (*objectum quod*) from some kind of intermediary (*objectum quo*) through which we apprehend it. But can we believe in sensible and intelligible species as "forms" somehow filtered through and embedded in "matter" at each stage in the process, including the "matter" of the passive intellect? At any rate I am sure that these views need not only exposition in Aristotelian terminology, but more translation into other terminologies and examination as to their foundations, if they are to commend themselves. And if Thomists depart as far from "essentialism" (the view of the priority of archetypal ideas over individual substances) as Dr Mascall wants them to do, I am not sure whether it may not have repercussions on their theory of knowledge. For the Thomist view of knowledge as confrontation with an "intelligible order" of beings involves, if I am not mistaken, a view of this intelligible order as embodying "specific essences." One would like to see a thoroughgoing discussion of the status of general terms and definitions in an "existentialist," as opposed to "essentialist," form of scholasticism.

The point is that Thomist realism grew up in the context of an Aristotelian logic and biology of real kinds in which dogs are and have always been dogs, and so there is an essential form of "caninity" which the mind recognizes as exemplified in individual instances of Poms and Alsatians, and when it does so then it is confronted with "a being of the intelligible order" in this individualized essential form. I think we can avoid nominalism if we allow that it is an empirical fact that some things resemble some things more than they resemble others, and we may also be able to say that these resemblances are the result of causal properties in the things concerned, and that this gives us a certain objective justification in the use of class-concepts. But if the classes are not fixed kinds (*e.g.*, the doubtful instance of whether this beast is an Alsatian wolf or a wolf-hound), we have to say that class-concepts are idealizations, used as mental tools in understanding nature, serviceable because observation and experiment bear out the assumption that there are genuine systematic similarities, but nevertheless these similarities are expressed in our class-concepts in highly simplified forms, and there are always ragged edges where their applicability can be disputed. I have stressed this point because Thomist epistemology still primarily presents the problem of knowledge as that of classification under specific essences, abstracted by the mind from the individual instances with which it is confronted in sense-perception. This seems to depend on a pre-evolutionary view of nature as made up of limited repertoire of fixed kinds. If we say that nevertheless within certain limits we are

all prepared to say that dogs are dogs and wolves are wolves, the qualifying phrase "within certain limits" shows that we have something more complicated than "abstraction" in the Thomist sense. Abstraction is thought of apparently as a sort of "drawing out" by the mind of an intelligible structure somehow embedded in the matter. I have written "sort of" and "somehow" deliberately in order to show how metaphorical terms like "abstraction" are apt to be, and how much they need not to be taken as sufficient explanations but to be further clarified. If "drawing out" is not the sort of thing that happens when we use an abstract idea, must we not say that the abstract idea is an idealization, part of an apparatus symbolically constructed by the mind in an attempt to understand nature, but that, as every systematist and taxonomist knows, its application at the fringes is doubtful and a matter for decisions which are not logically demonstrable? There are only no "ragged edges" in the case of abstract universals such as triangles, which are purely logical constructs.

We can applaud Thomists for trying to maintain an *ultimate* realism, and for being prepared to say that there are some kind of intermediaries involved in knowing. I think we must be able to say both that we are in direct causal and experimental contact with a real world beyond us, and also to say that the *concepts* through which we seek to know it are constructed and not simply apprehended in and "abstracted" from objects of perception, and so the "order and connexion of ideas" cannot be the *same* as "the order and connexion of things." We nevertheless believe that these constructions can lead to information about the world because they are guides to experimental activity, and experimental activity is possible because of our direct interaction with the environing world. But even so, especially if, as Dr Mascall says, the object of perception is grasped by a mind which is both sensing and conceiving, I think we must allow that our intellectual activity of constructing interpretative concepts and idealizations affects our awareness of objects. This means that even if at the end of the day we are realists, we must acknowledge the force in some of the subjectivist elements in Kantian and post-Kantian theories of knowledge, which Dr Mascall thinks that the Thomist epistemology should enable us to by-pass.

I have dwelt on these difficulties because I do not know of any satisfactory treatment of them in Thomist literature. Perhaps in his next book Dr Mascall will give us a more detailed analysis of the fundamental premisses of Thomism, rather than (as he has so admirably done here) an exposition of the deductions which can be based on them. If in so doing he will examine the difficulties some of us (and those not only logical positivists) find in the premisses themselves, he may be able to perform the service of bringing the Thomist tradition in philosophy into closer contact with other contemporary ways of philosophizing. And this would surely be for the benefit of all of us.

DOROTHY EMMET.

John Bunyan and Arthur Dent

To attempt, at this date, to offer further investigation into the sources of John Bunyan's masterpiece is to a great extent an unprofitable occupation. Yet these notes are offered for the the illumination they shed upon a wider area in Bunyan's work than that which is actually offered as derivative.

All readers of Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* will recall the fifteenth paragraph where he mentions his marriage to the daughter of religious parents, who came to him in great poverty, carrying as a dowry two small books:

> This woman and I, though we came together as poor as poor might be, not having so much household stuff as a dish or spoon betwixt us both, yet this she had for her part, *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* and *The Practice of Piety*, which her father had left when he died.

This passage contains information for the reader of Bunyan which was missed, for instance, by George Offor, editor of Bunyan's complete works. His comment after reading this passage and the two books mentioned is merely biographical:

> The mention of his wife's father being a godly man, and not mentioning anything with regard to his own parents, strengthens my conclusion that they were not professors of religion.[1]

Elsewhere, assessing Bunyan's probable debt to *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven*, he says:

> After a careful and delightful perusal, no trace can be found of any phrase or sentence having been introduced into *Pilgrim's Progress*.[2]

He had read the work in the author's own copy as part of a detailed survey of the source books, including in his bibliography almost all books with the word Pilgrim in the title. Yet after this labour he was forced to repeat Bunyan's own assertion:

> It came from mine own heart, so to my head,
> And thence into my fingers trickled;
> Then on to my pen, from whence immediately
> On paper I did dribble it daintily.

However, his perception was not as acute as his appetite for books in black-letter. Seeking mere plagiarism he found little; a more intensive study would have produced more interesting results.

The author of *The Plain Man's Pathway* was Arthur Dent, a Puritan minister, born at Melton Mowbray in 1553, and educated at Christ's College, Cambridge. His duties lay in the parish of South Shoebury in Essex, from which he sent forth several books of sermons and devotions. His masterpiece appeared in 1601 and rapidly became popular; but even before this he was known for his *Sermon of Repentance* (1582) and for his part in the vestiarian controversy with Whitgift and Bishop Aylmer. Thomas Nashe, in his *Almond for a Parrat* (1590), wrote:

[1] *The Works of John Bunyan*, ed. George Offor, 1854, Vol. I, p. 7.
[2] *Ibid.*, III, 45.

> I have not beene in Essex yet, but Ile set in my staffe there as I go home, for I have a petition for my brother that made the Sermon of Repentance to deliver up for me to the Councell: but it must not be such a one as he delivered for himselfe to my Lord Treasurer beginning with O sweet Margery, could thy eyes see so fare, thy hands feele so farre, or thy eares heare so farre &c. for then every serving man will mocke us.[1]

The point of much of this is lost, but it suggests that the author of the Sermon was in some way a national figure. When he wrote his great book, he was one of the most prominent English authors, it vieing with Edmund Bunney's version of Robert Person's *Christian Exercise* as the most widely read of late Elizabethan productions. He was slow to lose that position, and his voice was one that persisted throughout the ensuing century. Church and university libraries received his book, and the poor continued to avail themselves of this guide to salvation. It presented the Calvinist doctrines "dialogue-wise for the better understanding of the simple," but it was intended "for all of all sorts." Margaret Bunyan was one of many thousands who owned copies of its editions during the seventeenth century.

The book is a long dialogue between four characters, the Divine (Theologus), the Honest Man (Philagathus), the Plain Man (Asunetus), and the Caviller (Antilegon). The social and religious duties of the Christian, the signs of damnation and the Commandments, are discussed until the Plain Man is convinced of his need for salvation and is set rejoicing on his pathway to heaven. The serious intention does not prohibit light relief, and the Caviller provides entertainment and adds to the liveliness of this dialogue. There are in it few actual traces of material that Bunyan might have picked up, but, more important, the persistence of medieval religious instruction is clearly felt and preserved alive a century after the date confidently given as the beginning of Modern England. Bunyan's England was still impregnated with a way of life which persisted and which is caught almost for the last time in *Pilgrim's Progress*.

The chief debt Bunyan owed to Arthur Dent was the plan for his novel *The Life and Death of Mr Badman*. Offor, whose verdict on that book was slightly unfavourable, was unable to see this fact. The speakers are reduced to two in number, Wiseman and Attentive, and they are discussing the life of one man instead of the fate of mankind. Knowing the importance of concrete presentation, Bunyan chose to modify Dent's method and show in the life and death of that one wicked man all that had been done before in the several lists of causes and remedies for sin, typical of the medieval sermon. The more superficial aspects of this borrowing have been outlined by Prof. J. B. Wharey,[2] and a pair of parallel quotations will best show the relative qualities of these books:

> For it is hard to find a man that will speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth from his heart, in simplicity and plainness, at

[1] I am indebted to Mr E. D. Mackerness, who drew my attention to this passage in *Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, Vol. III (1905), p. 376.
[2] *Modern Language Notes*, XXXVI, 65-79.

> all times, in all places, and amongst all persons, without all glozing and dissembling, either for fear, gain, flattery, men pleasing, hiding of faults, or any sinister respect whatever.[1]
>
> When he was but a child, he was so addicted to lying that his parents scarce knew when to believe he spake truth; yea, he would invent, tell, and stand to the lies that he invented and told, and that with such an audacious face, that one might even read in his very countenance the symptoms of a hard and desperate heart this way.[2]

Dent is stating the general case as a theologian; Bunyan is interested as a novelist in the creation and *evaluation* of character. The same process could be repeated with other sins, showing similarities in phraseology. Both books have people who "belch out" oaths; both quote Prov. xxiii, "The drunkard shall come to poverty," and dilate upon the social distresses caused by such sins as drunkenness, whoredom, and idleness. Nevertheless one should be cautious in equating passages in this way: one can only show similar trends of thought, which one author might well have reached without specific study of the other. The dramatizations in Bunyan's book, however, owe something to Dent as a starting point—*e.g.*, the abstract Contempt for the Clergy develops into the episode in which Mr Badman forbids his wife to attend church.

Before dealing with the wider implication of the debt that exists between the authors, it is to be recorded that there are other verbal resemblances that Prof. Wharey had not discovered. The most important is that "the gripple-muck rakers" become the Man with the Muck Rake: the others come from Dent's minor sermons. In the *Sermon of God's Providence*, it is likely that Bunyan found:

> When she [his wife] laid this in Diogenes his dish that he went into a stewes or brothel-house, why, saith he, the Sunne cometh thither also;[3]

and in *Sermon of Repentance*:

> If upon their deathbed they can saie a few good words and cry God mercy and say their praiers, . . . foolish people of the world will exalt them, saieing, He made a very good end as any man could make, he died as quiet as a lambe, and set all things in order before he died;[4]

which ultimately became:

> If he began to talk, she could lay in his dish the whores that she knew that he had haunted, and she could fit him also with cursing and swearing.
>
> He died still and quietly; upon which you made observation that the common people conclude, that if a man dies quietly, and as they call it, like a lamb, he is certainly gone to heaven; when, alas, if a wicked man dies quietly, if a man that has all his days lived in notorious sin, dieth quietly: his quiet dying is so far off from being a sign of his being saved, that it is an uncontrollable proof of his damnation. This was Mr Badman's case, he lived wickedly even to the last, and then went quietly out of the world; therefore Mr Badman is gone to hell.[5]

---

[1] *The Plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven* (London, 1640), p. 132
[2] *Mr Badman*, Everyman edition, p. 154.
[3] *A Sermon of God's Providence* (London, 1608), Sig B, 8, recto.
[4] *A Sermon of Repentance* (London, 1583), Sig. D, 7, verso.
[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 279 and 295 respectively.

Critics of *Mr Badman* have found the quiet death an original touch improvised as a startling innovation in a book which is laden down with the more normal *exempla* of violent death. It is true, for instance, that the official religion of the Elizabethan Homily on Repentance had contained nothing of this, but Dent's creed makes this Judgment a theological possibility, infinitely justified. In Bunyan's book, it gains from its dramatic juxtaposition with disembowellings and infernal and celestial flames.

Most important is the connexion between the characters themselves. Ignorance is one of the most important of Bunyan's creations in an allegory whose scheme boasts none of the traditional deadly sins. His place in the allegory has been interpreted variously. The more sophisticated exponents have found no place for the interpretation that seems most obvious. They have preferred to describe him as a religious sentimentalist and optimist, when he is, rather than these, a personification of the Incorrigible Ignorant of Jesuit theology. His entry, through a little crooked lane, is nothing more than a demonstration of the text from the Gospel, *qui non intrat per ostium in ovile, sed aliunde, fur est, et latro.* He is punished for this false pretence and presumption. His faith:

> I know my lord's will, and I have been a good liver; I pay every man his own; I pray, fast, pay tithes, and give alms, and have left my country for whither I am going,[1]

derives subtly from the text given to the Caviller, who has pleaded, in turn, for all the sins, and finds the attitude of Dent's Church towards modern life impossible:

> I say my prayers every night when I am in bed; and if my good prayers will do us no good, God help us. I have always served God duely and truely, and had him in my minde. I do as I would be done unto . . . I am sure if I be bad, I am not the worst in the world, there bee as bad as I. If I go to Hell, I shall have fellows, and make as good shift as others.[2]

Such is the tone of the talkative bickering which persists whenever the Caviller is aroused by the word of the Gospel. At the end of the book, the Plain Man sees clearly that Antilegon is (for all his plausibility) a dangerous acquaintance. The Plain Man is ignorant but humble; the Caviller ignorant, presumptuous, and self-righteous. The two companions for Christian, Faithful and Hopeful, derive from the former; the latter is a blend of Worldly Wiseman, Talkative and Ignorance. The distinction between the untaught is important and the purpose of the two books. The message of salvation that Bunyan learnt from Dent lies beneath any of the superficial resemblances that may yet be found, and has been best expressed, in another context, by Richard Baxter:

> A wicked man is one that maketh it the principal business of his life to prosper in the world, and attain his fleshly ends. And though he mat read and hear, and do much in the outward duties of his religion, and forbear disgraceful sins; yet this is all upon the bye. A converted man is one that

[1] *Pilgrim's Progress,* Everyman edition, p. 146.
[2] Dent, *op. cit.,* p. 297.

> makes it the principal care and business of his life to please God, and to be saved; and takes all the blessings of this life but as accommodations in his journey towards another life, and useth the creature in subordination unto God.[1]

Bunyan's insight was undoubtedly refined by a study of the work of better educated writers. He found a Calvinist religious primer still suitable for his use in discussing the morals and manners of the middle class of the Restoration period, even though the ideas and beliefs of the Middle Ages were still so firmly to be found in it.[2] When he published his version of *The Plain Man's Pathway*, it had become, under his hands, the first of the great modern novels. Its greatness is purchased by its expression of codes of moral behaviour. Jane Austen had little doubt of the unquestioned values which she observed in dealing with her characters and describing the ways in which social relations must continue if life is to be practicable. Bunyan's vision was finer; his was not limited by purely "social" criteria: for him these sprang from the soil of religious life. He shared this view with the greatest secular writers of his time, for he found civilization at a time in which this was possible. He was not to remain as content as Jane Austen. Cultural life was changing as he was writing and preaching, and the difference in tone and outlook between *Pilgrim's Progress* and *Mr Badman* is an indication of the secularization of English culture. But if we look backward, the climate of opinion is constant between *The Plain Man's Pathway* and *Pilgrim's Progress*. The former book was still an accurate explanation of life when Bunyan read it in his early married life, and the spirit of it so pervaded his mind and tempered his literary digestion that it was not only the handy compendium of tags and questions that Prof. Wharey has found it, but also part of an attitude to living.

MAURICE HUSSEY.

Ordinands' Examinations

THE pamphlet recently issued by C.A.C.T.M., *The Purpose and Scope of Clergy Training*, has concentrated some attention on Anglican Theological Colleges, and many priests and laymen have not hesitated to comment thereupon. Some comments on present practice may perhaps usefully be made by one who is himself an ordinand: such remarks as are offered are intended to be helpful and not destructive, and they are made with (it is hoped) a due appreciation that they affect only a small part of an ordinand's total training, the rest of which is carried out, generally speaking, in a way which makes praise from an ordinand almost impertinent. These remarks,

---

[1] *A Call to the Unconverted to Turn and Live*, in *Baxter*, ed. T. W. Jenkin (London, 1846), pp. 83-4.

[2] I have discussed the importance of Dent's book at greater length in *Modern Language Review* (Jan., 1948).

which concern the aim, method, and syllabus of ordinands' examinations, are not directed towards any particular theological college.

Might not the whole pattern of the General Ordination Examination usefully be reviewed? A man who has not got special exemption for age or for (generally speaking) a first or second class degree, is faced with the necessity of taking and passing fourteen papers in two years. In *Training for the Ministry* (Final Report of the Archbishops' commission, 1944) it is stressed that mere cramming for examinations is a "very serious evil and its effect is disastrous" (p. 37). Yet there is general agreement that the syllabus for G.O.E. cannot be cut down: it is the minimum required of a man who is to be ordained to be a "Minister of the Word." This syllabus is about one and a half times as big as the two-year syllabus for the Final Honours School of Theology at Oxford (the Cambridge Tripos being scarcely comparable in time and pattern of syllabus): yet, despite all the other commitments of an ordinand, it is conducted on a modified system of that school. Papers for G.O.E. must be taken in groups of not less than four; but a failure in one paper of a group which has the effect of bringing down the average for the whole group below the required marks, necessitates the *whole group* being taken again, although in individual papers the candidate may have satisfied the examiners. All this would be quite understandable if the examination were considered to be simply a series of memory tests, which are thought to be sufficiently severe only if taken in groups of not less than four papers. But there is a timely reminder (*Training for the Ministry*, p. 42) that "the worst result of an overcrowded syllabus is that it leads to the loading of the memory rather than the opening of the mind and the strengthening of the spiritual understanding." There may well be good reasons why ordinands should be required to take again papers which they have once passed, and so add to an already crowded syllabus: but if *the present practice is maintained*, could not these good reasons be clearly stated? For at first sight it does not seem to help a weak-kneed man to give him an extra burden to carry.

Again, it seems at first sight conducive to "cramming tactics" that in a three-hour G.O.E. paper the candidate is required to attempt five questions (including possibly a fairly long gobbet question), while four questions are all that need be answered in an Oxford Theology paper. If the Oxford examiners can assess a man on four questions (with a fifth to be undertaken if the examinee wishes), surely the G.O.E. examiners can do likewise. It is exceedingly difficult to write an answer which shows evidence of "the opening of the mind and the strengthening of the spiritual understanding" if one is constantly conscious of a frantic race against time. Once more there may be excellent reasons for the G.O.E. requirements, but, if *the present practice is maintained*, a statement of these would be useful. The practice is not self-explanatory.

A more radical criticism could be levelled against G.O.E. that its weakness lies in the attempt (mainly by "Oxbridge" men) to fit an "Oxbridge" pattern of examination on to a "Redbrick" syllabus.

The "Oxbridge" method is presumably designed to assess a man's intellectual class in comparison with his fellows'. Men work for a "First," and the examination is justified by its successes. But G.O.E., one imagines, is directed primarily towards passes not classes, towards satisfying the examiners about the opening of the mind and spiritual understanding, as well as the sufficient loading of the memory.

Might not this be better achieved if a method were adopted for so large a syllabus more after the model of "Redbrick," or even American universities? Such a method might be as follows. Two out of the fourteen examinations could be taken each term, leaving the last of an ordinand's eight terms free for general reading and such special study as is desirable on the eve of his ordination. The examination would take place near the beginning of each term, thus ensuring some real study during the four vacations of the year. The previous term's intellectual work would be all but exclusively directed towards the two papers to be taken at the beginning of the next term. The first papers would not be taken by a "new boy" until about fifteen weeks after he had joined his theological college. Work would be simplified for students, staff, and examiners. Lectures and supervisions (as far as they are concerned with the G.O.E. syllabus) would all be directed to four subjects only (two each for first-year and second-year men) and examination papers likewise. A failure to pass in one paper would involve re-examination on that paper but no other. An ordinand, by concentrating simply on two subjects, would be able to grapple with the issues they involve much better than he can now, when time is wasted and concentration lost by the mental gymnastics involved in continually switching from one subject to another, and trying to involve oneself simultaneously in too many diverse subjects.

Such a scheme might be open to particular objections (such as the undesirability of a college losing half its members at one time). Particular colleges could adopt it if they wished, but flexibility could be effected and the main object of the scheme gained if candidates could take as many papers at once as they wished, and the time of examination were altered to the beginning instead of the end of term.

Could not the case of a man who has taken a "third-class" degree in theology be reviewed? Such a man has probably spent at least two years studying theology: he comes up to a Theological College full of enthusiasm and eagerness. And then he finds he has to start his studies all over again. Such a discovery damps the enthusiasm of the keenest. Obviously he needs further Biblical study—but does he always need to take all the Biblical papers again? If his third-class degree is a true judgment on his intellectual ability (providing he has worked reasonably hard, as an ordinand can generally be counted upon to have done), the taking of further papers on the subject is not likely to help him: the tragedy is that he may (and often does) get staler. It would be better for him not to have taken an university degree in theology rather than risk this. Could not University

College tutors and chaplains be asked to dissuade obvious "thirds" from reading theology? Or alternatively could not the "thirds" be excused Biblical papers in G.O.E., or at any rate those Biblical papers in which their standard was second-class and not third-class? This would involve co-operation between G.O.E. and University examiners. But the request is so eminently reasonable (and the secrecy at present maintained by the Universities is so mysterious in examinations so scrupulously conducted), that there can be no reason why the theological faculties at Oxford and Cambridge, London and Durham, etc., should not be at least *asked* to give C.A.C.T.M. the relevant marks. If this were done, a person who got a "third," because, although most of his Biblical papers were second-class, he was dragged down by his doctrine and church history papers, could then be relieved from the tedium of taking papers again when there appears to be no need.

The present scope of the paper on Christian Ethics appears to fall between two stools. A very strong case could be made for restricting the scope of the examination to New Testament ethics. If it is agreed that only a preliminary study can be given to the subject at a theological college, there are good reasons for an ordinand to concentrate solely on the New Testament *didache*, and acquire a very thorough and complete knowledge of it, instead of what must necessarily be a rather superficial survey of a large field of ethics.

But if the present pattern of this paper is maintained, surprise might be felt that the simpler books on Religious Psychology are relegated in the *Purport and Scope of Clergy Training* to post-ordination training (pp. 39, 40), especially in view of the insistence that "the training within the College itself must be directed to fitting men for the task which, when they are ordained, they will have to face" (p. 19). For if one half of the examination has, as its terms of reference, "an introductory survey of the nature and validity of the moral judgment," should not the candidate have at least some critical knowledge of modern psychological theories which many in the outside world imagine to have destroyed the idea of a moral judgment itself? Ought not the ordinand, even in his theological college days, to learn the criteria for distinguishing mental illness from moral evil? The admixture of some psychology would make the present course not only more interesting but also more relevant.

Finally, could not the purpose of the deacon's examination be reviewed? What is its purpose? Is it solely to enable the archdeacon to give a literally exact answer at the Ordination Service? If G.O.E. is a satisfactory examination, what is the purpose of a further examination? Or if the bishop is not satisfied with G.O.E., why do his ordinands have to take it? No doubt there may be good answers to these questions, but many theological students would be glad to hear them. The deacon's examination, which is conducted during an ordinand's last term at his theological college, is particularly difficult to understand; for although it may be the intention of the examiners that the ordinand should take it in his stride without any

special preparation, it will certainly have a "psychological" effect upon him and hardly be conducive to the peace and quiet which he wants and needs in his last term.

The aim of these notes is to suggest that action should now be taken to abolish or alter the following:

(*a*) Re-examination in individual papers in which the examiners have previously been satisfied.
(*b*) The present practice of taking papers in groups of four.
(*c*) The number of questions in a paper which a candidate is required to answer.
(*d*) Re-examination in all eight Biblical papers for a man who has a "third."
(*e*) The scope of the paper on Christian Ethics.
(*f*) The deacon's examination.

These suggestions and criticisms may seem cumulatively to be severe, but only those parts of ordinands' examinations which seem to have unsatisfactory features have been discussed, while the many excellent and fruitful features of G.O.E. have not been mentioned. All that has been attempted is to suggest that what is good may be made better.

AN ORDINAND.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr Boycott is a farmer and a Lay Reader. He contributed an article on "The Land and Sacramental Theology" in February, 1948.

The Most Rev. Philip Carrington is Archbishop of Quebec.

Miss Dorothy Emmet is Professor of Philosophy in Manchester University.

Mr Hussey is Lecturer in English at the Cambridgeshire Technical College.

CORRESPONDENCE

SCOUTING AS AN INSTRUMENT OF EVANGELISM

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It was no part of my purpose to attack Scouting, but merely to expose the root ideas from which it draws its sustenance. All human institutions, whether complete in themselves or not, are informed by an idea or a complex of ideas. But (as in the case of Scouting) the philosophy behind the thing, when revealed, sometimes surprises even the adherents themselves!

Mr Luard, in your October issue, seemed to imply that he used Scouting as a vehicle of sanctification, which is interesting, but hardly relevant to the situation in England. The community to

which he refers is both extremely isolated and in other ways extraordinary. He himself in such circumstances would, in effect, be his own Commissioner and could do what he pleased. Mr Colquhoun is more conventional, and has, I fear, missed the point of my article. One of my arguments concerned the relativism with which Scouting is riddled. Can he not see that if one is to admit mutually contradictory views of God, His nature, and His dealings with man as legitimate fulfilments of the Promise, then in effect religion need have no validity at all on the broad view? I tried to show that this is not merely an academic argument. To produce good citizens is a worthy aim, but then doubtless the Communist Youth Organizations would claim no less a purpose. The point is, surely, what sort of citizens? And that will inevitably depend upon their kind of religion. Scouting, he says, considers religion "desirable," but "the Christian Church cannot claim the patent rights." There is a logical fallacy here which I endeavoured to indicate.

Scouting can be used for evangelism if suitably adapted. But what a pity that a powerful movement for training boys, originated by a Christian man in a Christian country, was not founded specifically to give its adherents the priceless treasure of the Christian Faith! What a pity that brotherhood in Scouting does not *ipso facto* mean brotherhood in Christ! Then, indeed, the Church might not need castigating for not producing enough Christian Scout leaders, for they would "all know me, from the least even unto the greatest."

Yours faithfully,
E. H. Levinge.

St Michael's Vicarage,
London, S.W.11.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Early Traditions of Israel: A Critical Analysis of the Pre-deuteronomic Narrative of the Hexateuch. By C. A. Simpson. Basil Blackwell. 63s.

To work through the whole of this long and elaborate treatise, weighing all its statements, verifying all its references to other authorities, scrutinizing all its many chains of internal cross-references so as to make quite sure that what begins as "conjecture" is not allowed, by sheer force of repetition, to rise to the status of "known fact," would take a very long time. On the other hand, to pass judgment on the book without doing most of these things is to run the risk of being unfair. A reviewer with only a limited amount of time and space at his disposal will therefore be wise to confine himself to giving a brief general description of the work before him and a few cautious hints concerning the impression it has made upon himself.

If various prefatory notes and two excellent indexes are left out of account, Dr Simpson's book falls into two unequal parts, the first concerned chiefly with analysis, the second mainly with reconstruc-

tion. The first part contains—Introduction (pp. 19-36); notes on Introduction (pp. 37-49); An analysis of the narrative Genesis i, 1-Judges ii, 5 (pp. 51-329); notes to Analysis (pp. 331-402); Lists of Hebrew words and forms characteristic of Documents: Table A—words and expressions characteristic of J or E Documents (pp. 403-409); Table B—words and expressions characteristic of P Document and Rp (pp. 410-414); Table C—certain words and phrases appealed to in the analysis as indicative of a deuteronomic hand (pp. 415-417).

The second part contains—The Beginnings of Jahvism (pp. 419-425); The J1 Document (beginning with Exodus and continuing in the order, Numbers, Judges, Joshua, Genesis) with commentary (pp. 427-476); the J1 Document in its original order (*i.e.*, beginning with Genesis, pp. 477-489); the J2 Document with commentary (pp. 491-580); the E Document with commentary (pp. 581-659).

In the section headed "Introduction," having sketched the history of Hexateuch-criticism from Isaac of Toledo (c. A.D. 1000) to Eissfeldt (1935), Dr Simpson goes on to tell us what led him to begin his work (the wish to test certain theories held by Eduard Meyer), what he set out to do ("to isolate the J and E material from the narrative of the Hexateuch, and to reconstruct the basic documents from which this material is derived"), and what conclusions he has reached. Amongst his conclusions are these: (*a*) At least three (originally distinct) traditions have contributed to the early growth of the Hexateuch narrative—the first originally belonging to the southern tribes, the second and third, respectively, belonging originally to two different sections of the northern tribes. (*b*) The relation of these three traditions to the three Documents, J1, J2, and E, is rather complicated. The first tradition is represented in the greater part (but not in quite the whole) of J1; the second tradition is combined with the first in J2 (which is an elaboration of J1); the third tradition appears only in E, which, according to Dr Simpson, "represents a thorough-going revision and adaptation of the J tradition in the light of the tradition of a group within the house of Joseph other than that from which J2 had derived the material with which he had supplemented the narrative of his predecessor" (p. 35). (*c*) The Document J1 (containing approximately 575 verses, or parts of verses, of which Eissfeldt's *Hexateuch-Synopse* allots 242 to L, 112 to J, 21 to E) was written "at a time when the fusion of the traditions of the north and the south was still in its initial stages, probably at Hebron, during the early part of the reign of David" (p. 34). (*d*) The Document J2 comes from a time when " that process . . . was much further advanced. . . . This document . . . resulted from, and so reflects, the political events of the eleventh and tenth centuries, and, it may be assumed, was written in the second half of the tenth or first half of the ninth century" (p. 35). (*e*) The Document E, in which "the ancient tradition of the south, which had found its way into and become part of the tradition of the north, is rewritten in a northern interest," would seem to be the work of a northerner who, perhaps about 700 B.C., having "recently been confronted with

the J Document" and believing it to be "inaccurate both in fact and emphasis," undertook to rewrite the early history of Israel more correctly.

In the rest of his book Dr Simpson marks off, with great precision and many references to the findings of earlier scholars, those parts of the Hexateuch which he regards as belonging to J1, J2, and E respectively, and having disentangled them and occasionally rearranged their component parts in what he believes to be their original order, prints each one separately, section by section, each section followed by its commentary; he also prints J1 continuously, and gives a brief sketch of the early history of Jahvism as it might appear to anyone who accepts his account of J1 and J2. But never at any one time does he set out, clearly and fully, the principles that govern his documentary analysis and the *literary* criteria by which J1, J2, and E may be distinguished from each other. The absence of any such exposition, and the fact that in his very scanty lists of "Hebrew words and forms characteristic of Documents" J1, J2, and E are lumped together, without distinction, in a single table (pp. 403-409), rouse a suspicion that the ultimate basis of his work is not literary analysis but a reconstruction of history which rests almost entirely upon conjecture. This suspicion, which further study does nothing to dispel, makes it difficult to avoid the conclusion that, at the cost of enormous labour, an elaborate superstructure, often full of interesting detail, has been raised upon foundations more than a little insecure; and that, whereas a discriminating scholar, already well-acquainted with the study of the Hexateuch, might glean much valuable information from the details of the work, the beginner who took it as his starting-point would soon be completely bewildered.

F. S. Marsh.

Selwyn College,
Cambridge.

The Word of God and the People of God. By F. W. Dillistone. Church Book Room Press. 3s. 6d.

Theology of Crisis. By Ulrich Simon. S.P.C.K. 15s.

The Apocalypse of History. By E. Lampert. Faber and Faber. 18s.

These three books deal with the problem of history and how Christian men can understand it. Dr Dillistone discusses some of the fundamental questions posed by the revival of biblical theology: How is the New Testament related to the Old? How is the Bible the Word of God? How is the New Israel related to the Old? How is the Church the Body of Christ? Continuity or Discontinuity? The questions are discussed with a desire that the Church of England should seize upon the modern reformatory period to serve the Ecumenical Movement by articulating her own peculiar insights, and the author brings to the discussion a judgment that has been informed by the

best British and foreign biblical theology of recent years. I cannot escape the conviction that Dr Dillistone has allowed his work to suffer because he has forced the work of various scholars into the moulds of "catholicism" and "protestantism." We all know, as the first commission at Amsterdam realized, that this division is there, and that we must probe it to the depths in order to find some point of understanding and reconciliation; but I cannot think that, *e.g.*, Dodd's work must be classed as "protestant" and Phythian-Adams' as "catholic." The most significant thing about both these men seems to me to be that they have at least made a beginning with a type of biblical study that in a real sense gets behind this pervasive cleavage and speaks to catholics and protestants alike. For all this, Dr Dillistone has done Christians of many communions a real service and given us a serious and suggestive treatment of some of the basic questions of to-day. If this discussion can be carried on by churchmen of various persuasions, we shall begin to see our way forward more clearly. And in the end that means that it is by our being enlightened as to the revealing, redeeming activity of God in history that we learn the nature of our own life and destiny, and what is the nature of the church militant here on earth.

Mr Simon, a lecturer at King's College, London, has written a learned and somewhat difficult book on the Theology of Crisis. Mr Simon's erudition ranges wide, and he moves easily in Old Testament and New, in Church history and Philosophy, in Dogmatics and Metaphysics. While the book obviously owes much to what we in this country call "continental theology," it cannot be said that this book is an exposition of any continental "crisis theology." Instead, it seems to me that Mr Simon has exalted or debased the very notion of crisis into a category of metaphysics or something like it. Crisis can be traced throughout the natural order in the inorganic as in the organic realms. But the tension of crisis is only properly discerned as the product of a divine ingression, and so reaches its characteristic form only in human history. Even in history we must beware of using the word "crisis" too loosely, for many of the political crises, so-called, are but the accumulation of human errors in the sphere of cause and effect. A real crisis is essentially personal, and demands a free determination of the person in an irrevocable decision. This conception of crisis is used as an instrument of interpreting first the Old Testament, then the Gospels, and then the Apostolic Church and subsequent Church history. In a book that is encyclopedic in its scope, it is difficult for a reviewer to give a balanced picture of the whole. But Mr Simon uses his notion of crisis to interpret the long history of the Church in such a way that the Renaissance and the Reformation, the Aufklärung and the nihilism of Nietzsche, all find their place in the dialectic of developing crises. It would seem very questionable, however, whether all this rich manifold of history really lends itself to the constant analysis of "continuous substance — tension — free determination — climax—result," and it seems to the present reviewer that to suggest anything of the kind is to deny some of the basic principles of what

has so far been known in this country as the theology of crisis. Mr Simon seems to have attempted a reconciliation between such a theology and a metaphysical, philosophical, mystical theology by the apparently simple device of using the very notion of crisis as the intellectual counter in the game. But, whatever be the truth as between these two theological modes of thought, this attempt at pacification will not succeed. The Living God of the Hebrew-Christian tradition has been evaporated in the process. Crisis means firstly judgment; and the impression of the divine of which the Bible speaks is the coming of a living God in judgment and in mercy, who in that His coming reveals Himself to us men. We cannot but be grateful that there are signs that systematic thinking is being done on such a scale as this, but it seems necessary at this point to ask whether the learned author is not journeying down a *cul-de-sac*.

Dr Lampert has written a book on the Apocalypse of History in, at times, unforgettable English. The essence of what he has to say is that "to live historically and to apprehend History is to be aware of its *End*, to know 'the ends of time.'" But the end of time is not some special act coming supernaturally and catastrophically at the end of time's passage, but rather "the disclosure of a hidden content of time: in other words apocalypse." But lest that should leave us thinking that all talk of "the end" of the world in the Bible must be explained away in terms of the Johannine conception of eternal life here and now, Dr Lampert is quick to add that both modes of thought are necessary. Such a relation of time to eternity, and to its "end," is made concrete, or is revealed to us, in the Godmanhood of Jesus Christ; and it is this revelation of the end of time that bestows significance upon history. Nevertheless, it would seem impossible to dispense with the notion of a final disclosure, yet to come, of the meaning of history. Thus on p. 54 we read that "The last stage is thus a *consummation* of the whole process. The godly and the ungodly must confront each other in an all-integrating fulfilment which is a total judgment of History in the light of the final disclosures of its meaning. Then alone can the theme of world-history, the struggle between the divine and the demonic powers, be resolved." Dr Lampert is a Russian, and he is not one who accepts the Communist ideology of the Soviet state. It is all the more noteworthy that he provides, in the course of his argument, a profound and spirited analysis of the contribution of Karl Marx to a Christian understanding of man. He finds this in Marx's doctrine of "estrangement" or "alienation," by which is meant that division within man when, having created certain symbols and institutions, he ceases to recognize them as the products of his activity and comes to live under the impression that they are things or objects extraneous to and independent of his human nature and, finally, inaccessible to human influence. Thus the artisan is in our society estranged from the products of his craft, and in this state becomes a slave instead of a person. "Nobody, indeed, before Marx, had shown so clearly the spiritual role of productive agencies in human History." This is a

book which in Keats' phrase "teases thought," but it does so because it grapples with the central and fundamental issues of its theme. Dr Lampert brings a sound philosophical learning, a rich knowledge of the Greek fathers, and his own original mind to his task. This book should be required reading for all who are grappling with the problem of history: and chapter four on "The Historicity of Jesus Christ" should be prescribed for every theological student (clerical or lay) who is taught the disciplines of Synoptic criticism.

JOHN MARSH.

NOTTINGHAM.

MORALS AND INDEPENDENCE. By John Coventry, S.J. Burns Oates. 4s. 6d.

The contemporary secular-minded man is in a terrible muddle about right and wrong, if the sort of questions asked in "brains-trusts" and youth conferences are any indication. His misgivings are not surprising in view of the babel of different languages of ethical analysis he hears about him, and indeed finds himself using: languages rooted in the traditions of Renaissance humanism or modern science, languages presupposing old or new psychology, words and phrases absorbed into our culture from the great philosophers and usually robbed of their precision in the process. And this contemporary secular-minded man is not a stranger to readers of THEOLOGY. He is inside each one of us, as well as personified in those we meet; and unless this is so we cannot really *meet* them. There is a pressing need, then, not for still more introductions to Christian ethics, but for a Christian introduction to ethics, a very different thing, by a Christian philosopher who is out to meet the modern man where he is, and is prepared to begin by unravelling the language of contemporary discussion. To employ exclusively the closed language of scholastic moral theology is not very helpful for the need we have in mind, and smacks a little of the ivory tower. It is a pity that no theologian of our church has yet published the right book to put into the hands of intelligent laymen (and, incidentally, the right book for ordinands reading for the ethics paper in G.O.E., as a necessary preliminary to Kirk and Mortimer).

Fr Coventry's slim volume is a fine example of what can be done. Whatever we may think of its conclusions (and the author does not conceal either his fundamental rationalism or his acceptance of the Catholic Church's complete authority in faith and morals), its method deserves the highest praise. Fr Coventry meets the reader not at the church door but in the street. He talks about the problems of ethics in contemporary language, and with a fundamental honesty, and is not content with slick and easy answers. To our great relief he does not begin by bludgeoning us with Christian teleology and a set of definitions, but by discussing the vexed question of what is involved in having happiness as one's chief aim in life. The chapter on Duty which follows begins with Kant and the

notion of a complete divorce of duty from interest, of ethics from the satisfaction of desires. This, says the author, is bad psychology: man is a rational unity of consciousness: we don't, in practice, do a thing unless somehow we want to do it: there are specifically rational desires, proper to ethics: the essential characteristic of morally good action is that reason is in control. There can, then, be no necessary or final conflict between duty and interest, and the assumption that there is is responsible for much of the present-day rejection of "duty" altogether. Fr Coventry tries to "steer a course between naturalistic and non-naturalistic ethics" (p. 49). He would preserve the irreducible character of the moral judgment, while admitting that particular moral judgments are rooted in experience and biased by particular philosophies of life. It is not possible here to summarize the acute discussions which follow on Free Will, Is Ethics Enough?, and Moral Law. Throughout the author squarely faces contemporary difficulties and resists the temptation to over-simplify. In consequence his argument wins the reader's respect and gratitude, even though it may not always command his assent. Fr Coventry is to be congratulated on his book. We urgently need this sort of thing done on a bigger scale.

Basil S. Moss.

Lincoln Theological College
(Scholæ Cancellarii).

Dogmatics in Outline. By Karl Barth. Translated by G. T. Thomson. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

This relatively short book of 155 pages represents a series of popular lectures delivered to a general, non-specialized audience in the University of Bonn during the first wholly post-war summer, that of 1946. Dr Karl Barth is altogether too modest in his introductory disclaimers. It is true, as he warns the reader, that there is little in this volume which has not already been covered in his larger works, particularly in the *Kirchliche Dogmatik*; but these lectures, albeit hastily transcribed and, as he again forewarns us, somewhat lacking in finish, possess an interest and importance out of all importance to their small value as a positive contribution to our knowledge of Barthian theology.

As might be expected, such lectures on the fundamentals of the Faith, consisting of a clause-by-clause commentary on the Apostles' Creed, delivered in that time of unparalleled confusion, disillusionment, and hopelessness to students returned from the front line and the prison camps, possess a considerable historical interest, almost outweighing the value of their dogmatic content. As the author remarks, his book "smacks of a document of our time." As such, it is a courageous and effective piece of constructive apologetic and evangelism, pointedly addressed to the particular audience which met to hear it amid the ruins of the Kurfürsten Schloss. Topical allusions are fairly frequent and at times very plain-spoken. Those who have long felt disturbed at the Confessional Christians' choice of the issue of ecclesiastical freedom as their rallying point against

Hitler, instead of the wider question of man's nature and status, will rejoice at the frank admission that "unfortunately the faith and confession of the German Church remained embedded in the language of the Church, and did not translate what was being excellently said in the language of the Church into the political attitude demanded at the time." It was high time for this to be said. But have the German Church, and Barth himself, really learnt the lesson of that failure? It is easy to be wise about Hitler after the event: it is evidently less easy to apply that wisdom to the still more formidable menace of Stalin. The assertion that "anti-Semitism is the form of godlessness beside which what is usually called atheism (as confessed say in Russia) is quite innocuous," is, with all respect, rubbish. It is to be hoped, though one fears that the hope is still unfulfilled, that the continental Protestant Churches will rapidly outgrow that attitude of complacency towards Communism which may have been pardonable in 1946 but is now most pernicious.

On the other hand, Barth's strictures on anti-Semitism, which certainly needed saying to his audience, are carried to such lengths as to produce some odd theological reasoning. His remarks on the Christian's duty to the state, though obscurely expressed, are interesting and valuable, and perhaps the most theologically useful of his side-glances at current problems is to be found in the explanation of Divine omnipotence to which he is led by his analysis of arbitrary power (p. 48 f.).

We can touch on only a few of his dogmatic points. It is of interest, in view of other recent apologetic treatments of the subject, to notice that the starting-point for the inquirer into the nature of Christianity is the objective fact of the existence of the Church. Most of the argument will be familiar to the student of Barth. It is true that the defence of the place of reason in relation to faith (p. 22) is more strongly maintained than we might have expected; but on the other hand the rational proofs of the existence of God are dismissed with the sweeping assertion that they could properly be applied only to the objects of idolatry; and it is maintained (surely against the implications of Rom. i, 20) that the truth that God is Creator is revealed in the Incarnation alone, so that we are not to "read off the fact that God is its Creator" from "the existence of the world in its manifoldness." It is all of a piece with this familiar type of Barthian thought that the action of the Fathers in contending for the *homoousion* is commended in terms which clearly indicate surprise that anything good could have come out of Hellenism.

An admirable and entirely scriptural Christocentricity pervades the theology of these lectures; it is perhaps seen to the best advantage in relation to the doctrine of the Person of the Holy Ghost (p. 139). The section dealing with the Virgin Birth is by no means so satisfactory. It is strange doctrine that the divine initiative is emphasized by the exclusion from Christ's conception of "the male as the specific agent of human action and history, with his responsibility for directing the human species" (p. 99).

There is some valuable teaching on the nature of the Church, and it is to be regretted that this part of the book is so short; similarly, one could wish that some more space could have been devoted to the Sacraments. It would have been good if the short remarks on baptism as the objective witness to our justification could have been developed in the light of the views which Barth has recently expressed elsewhere on this topic; but we should be grateful for the brief glimpse of eucharistic eschatology with which the book ends.

It is probably too much to ask a translator to render Barth into English which reads as English and not merely as an irritating assortment of unnatural phraseology and strained metaphor; but I cannot think that this translation is successful. To mention two specific points, it is surely very odd to describe the Christ as "the Commissioner who comes out of Israel," and the favourite term of German theology, *Apokatastasis*, needs a paraphrase or note to become generally intelligible to the English reader.

Only two minor errors have been noticed—the misprints "supranational" for "supra-rational" (p. 23), and "spe" for "spes" (p. 115).

St. John's College, Oxford. G. W. H. Lampe.

The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenæus. By John Lawson. Epworth Press. 21s.

Not for many years has there been a book in English about the theology of Irenæus, and this is to be welcomed as the fruit of a careful and first-hand study of a vitally important figure in the Church of the second century. Mr Lawson knows his way about Irenæus, and his work has the merit of asking the right question. He starts from a remark of Reinhold Seeberg that "Irenæus is a Biblicist and he is the first great representative of Biblicism," and leads on to pose the question: How far is his theology really primitive and biblical? Here is an important problem which concerns our whole conception of the fidelity of the Church Fathers to the primitive Gospel.

In the first part of his study Mr Lawson discusses Irenæus' use of the Bible, his notion of authority and inspiration, and his methods of interpretation, the general upshot of the discussion being that, even though he may often be fanciful in his allegorism, he was not wholly out of touch with the true meaning of Scripture, and in interpreting St Paul had a marked success.

In the second part some leading ideas are considered with the same basic question in view. It might perhaps have been better had Mr Lawson been able to give an exposition of Irenæus' theology as a whole. But at any rate he gives a sympathetic account of certain aspects of Irenæus' doctrine, and evaluates his attainment by the standards of modern biblical theology; it is evident that he is much indebted to Emil Brunner and Bishop Aulén for his understanding of what this means.

It is his contention that Irenæus "is essentially Pauline" and that

his theology is "fundamentally of Biblical or Hebraic inspiration." The Apostolic Fathers breathe a moralistic atmosphere; indeed, "*the Shepherd* of Hermas is definitely to be condemned as an impoverishment of the Gospel of grace." But in Irenæus we find "a welcome token that this deterioration of spirit was not universal in the primitive Church, or, at least, that the Church speedily recovered from it" (pp. 250-1). Mr Lawson dissents from those scholars who have found in Irenæus a piety of the Johannine type, and would see in him a true disciple and exponent of St Paul. This, it need hardly be said, is a crucial question, and many students of the early Church may part company with Mr Lawson at this point.

Various points call for critical notice. It is not easy to agree with the view that denies any polemical edge to Irenæus' famous argument about the necessity of the four-fold Gospel (p. 45). The book starts badly with an introduction of some twenty pages containing summaries of two older studies of Irenæus by Duncker (1843) and Beuzart (1908). It is difficult to see what purpose is served by these outlines, and they give the reader the impression that he is likely to have a dull time with the rest of the book. In general, it appears that Mr Lawson is not quite at ease with the continental literature on his subject; there are too many references to French and German writers in the text of the work, giving it the appearance of a dry, academic dissertation. Mr Lawson has got hold of an exciting subject. It is a pity that he should dress it up in dull clothing .

Queens' College,
Cambridge.

H. Chadwick.

Ius Publicum Ecclesiasticum. By Ludovicus Bender, O.P. Bussum in Hollandia. N.p.

The Principles of Canon Law. By Hubert S. Box. Oxford University Press. 5s.

Professor Bender's aim is to show how the doctrine held by Roman Catholics, rightly expounded, coheres with the fundamental principles of social and juridical order. His thesis, written and argued lucidly in the Latin tongue, is in three parts. The first, on general and fundamental principles, concerns the nature of law and society, the seat of authority in a *societas juridica perfecta*, and hence its origin and place in the Church. The analysis is extremely valuable, and the vigour of the logic betrays the author's awareness that he is expounding principles of society for a generation which most needs them. Parts II and III concern respectively the internal and external public law of the Church, the first for the direction of her own subjects, the second regulating her relations with other perfect societies, especially the state. Marriage and the education of children have a chapter to themselves, and the Concordat a whole section of four chapters. These sections have the weakness neither of detachment from the contemporary struggle nor of submersion beneath it; the logic speaks to a real world without faltering.

Dr Box's pamphlet is both less and more academic. It is less, in that it purports only to outline the principles of Canon Law, simply, in English, and without the structure of formal disputation. It is more, in that it treats at times of a textbook Church from which the Church in history appears to have departed. What is done is well done; the author commends his subject to us by insisting that the purpose for which Canon Law exists must determine its content; ancient canons used for illustration are well chosen and accurately expounded; the discussion of fasting communion and clerical marriage, which together comprise the chapter headed Change and Cessation of Law, is temperate and judicious. But the chapter on Custom raises, or ought to raise, questions in the mind of English Churchmen which demand discussion. Canon Law recognizes a complex and strictly (though not uniformly) defined procedure whereby custom can change law, and by writings of this sort clergymen are being made aware of the fact. The King's Ecclesiastical Law, which governs this particular church at this point of her history—and is therefore a given factor which ought not to be ignored—knows no such procedure when the law is embodied in statute or defined in the courts. This fact writings of this sort tend to ignore; Dr Box ignores it, but responsible persons make themselves aware of it. The dilemma which results is obvious; it presents itself daily in every church. The need now is of writers who will do more than reproduce ancient canons and principles, and then leave them as though they were the final word—a practice exemplified in Dr Box's appendix on the Laity and the Hierarchy, and one, incidentally, used to stunt the growth of the Church Assembly for about seventy years, from 1850 to 1920; the need is of a thorough discussion of the principles underlying the two laws, in relation to the situation which now exists, and undertaken before any "issue" or "crisis" supervenes to cloud the air with interest or passion. Christopher St German did this effectively in the *Doctor and Student* in the sixteenth century; it needs to be done again now.

G. R. Dunstan.

Sutton Courtenay,
Berks.

SHORTER NOTICES

They Made me Sign. By John C. Heenan. Sheed and Ward. 5s.

This small book, with prefaces for Pagans, Protestants, and Priests, aims at stating in outline the distinguishing beliefs of the Roman Catholic Church so that a non-Roman contemplating marriage with a Roman Catholic may be made aware of the difficulties which are likely to spring from differences of faith and outlook. Such a mixed marriage is not recommended or encouraged; but the author, in pungent and popular style, takes a realistic view of two partners who, in spite of their conflicting traditions, have made up their minds to share their lives, and attempts to point out to them how they can shape a working policy. But clearly too much is attempted

within the small compass of this book, with the result that much of the subject matter is far too allusive for the Pagan. He is not likely, for example, to grasp what is written about the Baptism of Desire (p. 73), nor is the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception made clear to him in the section on our Lady (p. 66); the discussion of infallibility is also vague. Pagans would probably prefer to have the facts set before them; in no part of the book are the terms of the *Ne Temere* decree supplied.

Furthermore, the Protestant addressed in the book is a composite figure, sometimes apparently a member of the Church of England, at other times nothing more than a deist with no allegiance to a Church. Hence, such statements as "it is no longer forbidden for the Protestant to pray to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints" and "there can be few Protestants who would refuse that wonderful aid to prayer, the Crucifix," are much too general to be convincing. When the author quotes Article 25 to show that there are only two Sacraments for the Protestant, he misleads by inserting the word "only." When he claims to quote the relevant article on the Mass, he only cites the second sentence of Article 31 and omits the positive teaching about Christ's offering with which the article begins (p. 86).

Although happily free from the bitterness of religious controversy, the book will disappoint the kind of general inquirer who desires to know the implications of the beliefs peculiarly Roman and to understand the causes of the ancient controversies.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

George Simms.

A Herald of the Evangelical Revival. A Critical Inquiry into the Relation of William Law and John Wesley and the Beginnings of Methodism. By Eric W. Baker. Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

This is the second book on Law and Wesley to be published by the Epworth Press within three years. Unfortunately for its author, it was written first (being completed as long ago as 1941) and published second. The other book is J. Brazier Green's *John Wesley and William Law*, which was the Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1945. The result is that although such a study is needed and in the past has been neglected, Mr Green's book leaves little room for Dr Baker's, in spite of the claims made by Dr Baker in his introduction.

Like Mr Green, he devotes most of his book to showing that the fundamental differences between Wesley and Law after 1738 were on the questions of Mysticism and the Atonement, and with copious quotations and constant reminders that Law was a mystic living in seclusion and Wesley an itinerant evangelist, he much belabours the point. He sees Law as the schoolmaster to bring the Wesleys to Christ: Law was responsible for the moral awakening in the Wesleys but nothing more, then their ways were bound to part. The change which can be traced in Law's soteriology is interestingly treated.

This work is obviously a thesis which, if it had been necessary to

publish at all, should have been completely rewritten, partly because of the existence in print of Mr Green's book and secondly because Dr Baker's book reads like a thesis, not a book; in many places it degenerates into a catalogue of headings, quotations, and numbered points. The whole work is made more ponderous by numerous stage-directions such as "This will be our inquiry in a later chapter" and "We have already observed in the historical survey." Our sympathies with Dr Baker in having his thunder stolen from him cannot prevent us from saying that his is a book which the serious student can afford to ignore.

Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Michael Hennell.

The Way and the Faith: a Study in Early Church History. By A. Bevil Browne. New Edition. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

It is good news that this delightful introduction to the early history of the Church is again available. Anyone who does not know it should hasten to procure a copy.

Baptism To-day. Press and Publications Board. 1s. 6d.

This is a second interim report of the Convocation Committees on Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion. It surveys the course of the consideration that has already been given to the subject. No agreement is yet in sight about what ought to be done with regard to the so-called indiscriminate baptism of infants. The committees are certainly right in thinking that the time is not yet ripe for any general resolution of this problem. In the present report a series of questions concerning baptism is put forward for discussion by the clergy (discussion of them by the laity is not apparently regarded as of much importance). When the results are available, a final report will be prepared.

A. R. V.

The Story of the Parish of All Saints, Falmouth, 1924-1949. By Marian L. Wallace. By post 2s. 9d., from the author, at 17, King's Avenue, Falmouth.

This record of twenty-five years of church life, work, and generosity, though of primary interest to local parishioners, will interest also many West-Countrymen by adoption, and many who have known the vicar, the Rev. Clifford W. G. Wood, as a missioner and preacher further afield. No aspect of contemporary parochial life is forgotten; the illustrations are good, and the two portraits alone provide ample material for a study of character.

G. R. D.

INDEX TO VOLUME LII

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1949

PAGE

Agland, Sir Richard 213
Addison, W. G. C. 1
American Letters 97, 252, 363
Anglican Theology of Society and German Metaphysics 173
Another Lectionary? 162
Aulén, Gustav 82

Belgion, Montgomery 129, 377
Bennett, Frank 403

Books Reviewed (see also "Shorter Notices"):

Ady, *The Rôle of Women in the Church* (M. Turner) 79
Allen, *The Happy Issue* (J. C. Mears) 312
Anson, *T. B. Strong* (A. Fox) 364
Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline* (G. W. H. Lampe) 474
Bender, *Ius Publicum Ecclesiasticum* (G. R. Dunstan) 477
Bennett, *Christianity and Communism* (E. R. Wickham) 430
Berdyaev, *Towards a New Epoch* (C. Tompkins) 352
Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (J. E. L. Oulton) 432
Blackstone, *English Blake* (J. M. Murry) 308
Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (H. Balmforth) 194
Bouch, *Prelates and People of the Lake Counties* (J. C. Dickinson) 195
Box, *The Principles of Canon Law* (G. R. Dunstan) 477
Broadcast Psalter (C. W. Quin) 228
Brunner, *Communism, Capitalism and Christianity* (E. R. Wickham) 430
Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison* (M. A. Thomson) 225
Casserley, *The Christian in Philosophy* (E. L. Mascall) 276
Copleston, *Existentialism and Modern Man* (S. Godman) 189
Coventry, *Morals and Independence* (B. S. Moss) 473
Croegaert, *La Messe des Catéchumènes* (G. A. Michell) 192
Croxall, *Kierkegaard Studies* (M. Chaning-Pearce) 113
Cullman, *Les Premières Confessions de Foi Chrétiennes* (C. F. D. Moule) 152
Daniélou, *Origène* (W. L. Knox) 145
Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (W. L. Knox) 31
Davis, *Isaac Watts* (A. B. Webster) 149
Dewar, *Psychology and the Parish Priest* (W. W. S. March) 433
Dewick, *The Gospel and Other Faiths* (C. K. Sansbury) 186
Dillistone, *Revelation and Evangelism* (E. S. Urwin) 73
Dillistone, *The Word of God and the People of God* (J. Marsh) 470
Dunkley, *The Reformation in Denmark* (R. Cant) 193
Dvornik, *The Photian Schism* (G. Every) 77
Ehrenberg, *Vom Menschen* (R. H. Fuller) 272
Elliott-Binns, *The Beginnings of Western Christendom* (J. Stevenson) 314
Elmslie, *How Came Our Faith?* (C. W. Dugmore) 182
Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas* (H. Chadwick) 269
Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images* (W. Manson) 266
Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (J. G. Davies) 70
Gibb, *John Lilburne the Leveller* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 395
Gilson, *Dante the Philosopher* (F. J. E. Raby) 270
Griffith, *The Theology of P. T. Forsyth* (T. O. Wedel) 36
Hamer, *Karl Barth* (F. W. Camfield) 426
Hart, *The Life and Times of John Sharp* (J. H. Plumb) 313
Hodges, *Christianity and the Modern World View* (P. McLaughlin) 431
Hopkinson, *About William Law* (G. Seaver) 37
Isherwood (Ed.), *Vedanta for the Western World* (F. A. Smalley) 147
Jarrett-Kerr, *Our Trespasses* (E. S. Urwin) 73
Jaspers, *The European Spirit* (S. Godman) 189
Kaftal, G., *St Catherine in Tuscan Painting* (J. H. L. Waterson) 356

PAGE

Kelly, *The Armour of Christ* (C. Gardner) 274
Knight, *From Moses to Paul* (D. M. Baillie) 306
Laird, *On Human Freedom* (F. W. Camfield) 187
Lampert, *The Apocalypse of History* (J. Marsh) 470
Latko, *Origen's Concept of Penance* (R. P. C. Hanson) 391
Lattey, *The Book of Daniel* (H. H. Rowley) 183
Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of St Irenæus* (H. Chadwick) . . 476
Lecerf, *An Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics* (L. Hodgson) . . 305
Leslie, *The Psalms* (E. W. Heaton) 351
Lewis, *Transposition* (C. Tompkins) 352
McAdoo, *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology* (G. B. Bentley) . 390
Mann, *André Gide and the Crisis of Modern Thought* (M. Belgion) . . 116
Marcel, *The Philosophy of Existence* (F. W. Camfield) 187
Martensen, *Jacob Boehme* (P. R. P. Barker) 349
Messenger, *Two in One Flesh* (G. Simms) 393
Michell, *Eucharistic Consecration* (A. H. Couratin) 71
Micklem, *Religion* (D. W. Gundry) 75
Morris, *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt* (W. G. Symons) . . 354
Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement* (H. R. T. Brandreth) 347
Moule, *Charles Simeon* (A. B. Webster) 149
Murphy, *The Origins and History of Religions* (N. Micklem) . . . 388
Neill, *The Cross Over Asia* (C. K. Sansbury) 186
Osborn, *Holy Communion in the Church of England* (C. W. Dugmore) . 394
Patrick, *Pascal and Kierkegaard* (J. C. Mears) 34
Paul, *The Meaning of Existence* (C. Tompkins) 352
Pfister, *Christianity and Fear* (L. W. Grensted) 424
Phillips, *Walter Howard Frere* (F. E. P. S. Langton) 111
Rattenbury, *Eucharistic Hymns of J. and C. Wesley* (F. H. Durnford) . 275
Riley, *The Revision of the Psalter* (C. W. Quin) 228
Roberts, *Medieval Monasteries and Ministers* (J. C. Dickinson) . . . 350
Rouse, *The World's Student Christian Federation* (R. A. Reeves) . . 114
Sampson (Ed.), *The Englishman's Religion* (F. Bennett) 38
Sencourt, *St Paul, Envoy of Grace* (R. P. C. Hanson) 151
Shirley, *Elizabeth's First Archbishop* (T. M. Parker) 231
Shirley, *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas* (E. G. Rupp) . 428
Simon, *Theology of Crisis* (J. Marsh) 470
Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel* (F. S. Marsh) 468
Staudinger, *Das Schone als Weltanschauung* (R. G. Smith) 78
Stringer, *Degrees and Hoods* (C. A. H. Franklyn) 232
Sundkler, *Bantu Prophets in South Africa* (F. C. Synge) 316
Suzuki, *Mahayana Buddhism* (F. A. Smalley) 147
Sweetman, *Islam and Christian Theology* (F. H. Smith) 185
Talon, *William Law* (A. B. Webster) 149
Thieberger, *King Solomon* (T. N. D. C. Salmon) 115
Tomkins, *The Wholeness of the Church* (F. Bennett) 227
Trethowan, *Certainty* (H. C. L. Heywood) 310
Trimingham, *Islam in the Sudan* (E. F. F. Bishop) 396
Vidler, *The Theology of F. D. Maurice* (A. B. Lavelle) 180
Vine, *An Approach to Christology* (D. M. Baillie) 306
Warren, *The Truth of Vision* (D. M. Baillie) 153
Weidlé, *The Dilemma of the Arts* (J. Short) 154
Williams, *Seed of Adam* and *Arthurian Torso* (M. Belgion) . . . 74
Wolfenden, *The Public Schools To-day* (R. G. Lunt) 233

Boycott, W. S. 443
Browning, W. R. F. 22
Byrom, John 242, 416
Central College for the Anglican Communion, A 208
Chavasse, C. 171
Christianity and Secular Myths 368

PAGE

Church's Order, The 122
CLARKE, W. K. L. 261, 333
Clerical Study Circles 374
Confirmation and St Justin 448
Correspondence . 26, 67, 106, 139, 178, 219, 263, 302, 336, 383, 422, 467
COUTTS, J. 54
CRAFER, T. W. 327
Creation and Christology 443
CROSS, F. L. 8
DAMMERS, A. H. 138
DAVIES, J. G. 406
Decalogue, The Origin of the 333
DEMANT, V. A. 322
Devil and the Temptations of our Lord, The 102
DOCKHORN, KLAUS 173
EMMET, DOROTHY 453
EVANS, SEIRIOL 283
EVERY, EDWARD 135
Farrer's Bampton Lectures, Dr 168
Fasts of the Church, On Observing the 91
Germany Revisited 8
Gifford Lectures, 1947 322
GLENDENNING, F. J. 102
Gospel in the Old Testament according to Hebrews, The 248
HANSON, A. 248
HARDY, E. R. 97
Headlam and the Fourth Gospel, Arthur Cayley 17
HENDRY, G. S. 203
Heraldic Mottoes from the Old Testament 216
HUSSEY, M. 459
HUXLEY, H. H. 216
JARRETT-KERR, M. 410
John Bunyan and Arthur Dent 459
KEAN, C. D. 363
KELLEY, A. D. 252
KIRCHBERGER, C. 294
LEVINGE, E. H. 299
Little Gidding, A Link with 294
Lutheranism, The "Errors" of 82
MCEACHRAN, F. 288
Man after My Own Heart, A 129
MILFORD, T. R. 168
Modern Psychology and Belief in a Transcendent God 288
MULLER, E. 50
New Translation of the Bible 203
Ordinands' Examinations 463
Philosophy of Christian Existence, The 50
PITTENGER, W. N. 122
Prayer Book, The Arrangement of 171
QUEBEC, ARCHBISHOP OF 448
Richard Hooker and the Rites of Burial 406
ROSENDAL, G. 259
Sacrifice of the Mass in the Swedish Church 259
Scepticism and Revelation 410
Scouting as an Instrument of Evangelism 299
SCUPHOLME, A. C. 374
Shorter Notices . . 39, 80, 119, 155, 197, 234, 278, 319, 357, 397, 434, 478
Six Labour M.P.s in Sheffield 213
SMYTH, C. 368
Some Questions to a Modern Thomist 453

PAGE

SOUTHAMPTON, BISHOP OF 208
Spiritual Growth 416
Studies in Texts 22, 54, 138
Supplemental Ordinations, The Theory of 44
"*Sweet Auburn Again*" 283
SYMONDS, R. P. 91
TASKER, R. V. G. 17
Theology and Agriculture 16
Thoughts in a Straitened Church 403
Tract Cases 261
TURNER, H. E. W. 44
Unction of the Sick in the Western Church 327
Veneration of the Mother of God, The 135
WATERFIELD, R. 162
Weg on Bobbie 1
What is Mysticism? 242
"Why you should read it" 60, 377
WOOD, T. 60

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BLACKWELL: W. O. Lester Smith, *The Impact of Education on Society* (3s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY BLES: B. G. Saunders, *Christianity and Freud: An Interpretation of the Christian Experience in the Light of Psychoanalytic Theory* (8s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES: F. R. Hoare, *The Gospel According to St John* (6s. 6d.). J. R. Palanque, G. Bardy, P. de Labriolle, *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire*, Vol. I (25s.).

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY (PHILADELPHIA): Louis Childs Sanford, *The Province of the Pacific* ($3).

CHURCH UNION: T. G. Jalland, *The Book of 1549* (4d.); *Lambeth 1948 Reviewed* (6d.).

DACRE PRESS: M. R. Newbolt, *The Truth of the Bible* (4s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Edwin W. Smith, *Life and Times of Daniel Lindley* (21s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: T. F. Torrance, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man* (14s.); Hans Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* (21s.). [A revised edition of the English translation, first published in 1937.]

METHUEN: Walter Ullmann, *Medieval Papalism* (18s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: W. O. Lester Smith, *Education in Great Britain* (5s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: R. H. Preston and A. T. Hanson, *The Revelation of St John the Divine* (Torch Bible Commentaries), 7s. 6d.); George Every, *Poetry and Personal Responsibility* (2s. 6d.); E. W. Heaton, *His Servants the Prophets* (7s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: D. J. B. Hawkins, *The Essentials of Theism* (7s. 6d.); Henri de Lubac, S.J., *The Drama of Atheist Humanism* (15s.).

S.P.C.K.: S. L. Caiger, *Lives of the Prophets* (10s. 6d.); G. W. Lampe, *Some Aspects of the New Testament Ministry* (1s. 3d); E. C. Ratcliff, *The Booke of Common Prayer of the Church of England* (10s.).

C. A. WATTS: A. Machin, *What is Man?* (10s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

This Perverse Generation

By PETER MICHAELS **7/6 net**

Some of us are so polite that we avoid criticism on principle. Peter Michaels prefers charity to politeness, and reminds us in profound but not uncertain terms that, since Christ is the architect of the universe, nothing is properly ordered in the sphere of politics, economics, recreation, or education, unless the actions flow from careful study of the Divine blueprint.

POVERTY

An Essential Element in the Christian Life

By P. R. Regamey, O.P. **8/6 net**

Translated by Rosemary Sheed.

"This remarkable book, which comes from the heart of one who has seen at first hand some of the suffering of which he speaks . . . should be read by all . . . Miss Sheed has done a great service by making it available for English readers . . . The translation is idiomatic and clear." *Church Times*

SHEED & WARD, LTD.

110-111 FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

THE JEWISH PEOPLE AND JESUS CHRIST

By JAKOB JOCZ, Ph.D. 21s.

That Jesus of Nazareth, who for centuries has wielded power over millions of Gentiles, should remain a stranger to His own people, is a unique phenomenon requiring an explanation. The answer provided hitherto by Gentile and Jewish scholars is not entirely satisfactory, leaving some important questions unexplained. The author has tried to find a new approach to the whole problem by fixing his attention upon primitive Hebrew Christianity. But deeper research has inevitably led from the historical to the religious plane. Behind the Jewish attitude to Jesus Christ is a distinct philosophy of life not necessarily peculiar to the Synagogue. Thus a subject of historical interest evolves into theological significance.

LIVES OF THE PROPHETS

A Thousand Years of Hebrew Prophecy in its Historical Context

By STEPHEN L. CAIGER 10s. 6d.

An expansion of a work published in 1936. It contains chapters on the early prophets (Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha) as well as the writing prophets. The author accepts the main conclusions of modern criticism and writes a straightforward account which will be interesting to the general reader as well as valuable to the teacher and student.

S · P · C · K

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2

S·P·C·K

THE BOOKE OF COMMON PRAYER OF THE CHURCHE OF ENGLAND:

Its Origin and Revision, 1549—1661

By E. C. RATCLIFF — Cloth boards, **10s.**

This is the book specially commissioned by S.P.C.K.—whose whole history has been bound up with publishing the Prayer Book—to commemorate the 400th Anniversary of the Publication of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. In a brilliant introduction the most eminent living Anglican liturgist summarises the story of the Prayer Book and, in brief but meticulously scholarly notes, introduces the 80 full-page facsimiles which fully document his subject.

ONCE DARK COUNTRY

Recollections and Reflections of a South African Bishop

By A. W. LEE — **7s. 6d.**

This study of Africa, past and present, will rouse the enthusiasm of all those interested in the Church's Missionary activity and should be read by all who recognize the alternatives of co-operation or hostility between black and white.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT MINISTRY

By G. W. H. LAMPE — **1s. 3d.**

With imaginative scholarship the author, who is Fellow and Chaplain of St John's College, Oxford, points the way to a new approach to the vexed question of the Ministry by showing the limitations of exclusively Biblical research.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER AND THE PASTORAL MINISTRY

By ROGER LLOYD (Canon of Winchester) — **1s. 3d.**

This lecture, delivered to young priests, will prove of great interest to others besides priests, since the author emphasizes the essential pastoral duty of the laity.

PRIVATE DEVOTIONS

For the Young in Spirit of all ages

Compiled by Presbyter Anglicanus — **1s.**

This book, already widely known and used, contains a rule of life, morning and evening prayers, a scheme of weekly intercessions, a number of prayers for occasional purposes, a form of confession, and a method of preparation and thanksgiving for the Holy Communion. It has been revised and is being added to the S.P.C.K. list.

CHAPLAIN AND DOCTOR

By J. BURNETT RAE — **9d.**

This small book will be invaluable to all priests who visit patients in hospital as well as to official hospital chaplains. The author explains what the doctor expects and hopes from spiritual ministrations without in any way telling chaplains how to conduct their own business.

(*Published for the Church's Council of Healing*)

A COMPENDIUM OF CHRISTIAN LIVING

By J. C. WANSEY — **6d.**

This Compendium, whilst intended primarily for those, young or old, who are to be confirmed, will prove of value to all who desire to set their lives side by side with the age-old Christian pattern.

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2